DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 591 PS 016 408

AUTHOR	Townson, Monica; And Others
TITLE	Child Care: The Employer's Role. Report of the Task Force on Child Care: Series 4.
INSTITUTION	Canada Dept. of Supply and Services, Ottawa (Ontario).; Status of Women Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-662-14406-6; SW43-1/4-1985E
PUB DATE	Dec 85
NOTE	144p.; For other reports in this series, see PS 016 405-410.
AVAILABLE FROM	Status of Women Canada, Communications Unit, 151 Sparks St., Suite 1005, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 1C3.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Costs; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Employer Supported Day Care; Foreign Countries; *Program Design; Unions
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada; Maternity Benefits; *Parental Leave

ABSTRACT

The two research studies in this volume focus on the employer's role in child care. The studies were commissioned as part of an effort to provide detailed analyses of issues of special relevance to child care and parental leave policies and the effects of these issues on the Canadian family. Paper 1 provides a basis for the development of paid parental leave policies in Canada, reviewing maternity and paid parental leave programs in other countries. Such options as paid leave on the birth or adoption of a child, shorter working hours for parents, and extended leaves for child care by parents are considered. The paper reviews the provisions for paid parental leave in Canada, taking into account statutory benefits available through the Unemployment Insurance program and private arrangements for fully paid parental leave, such as those negotiated by some trade unions. Finally, the paper recommends paid parental leave options for Canada, developing a cost analysis of the options for application, with proposals for financing the programs. The second paper (1) provides an inventory and description of work-related day care programs and activities in Canada, (2) reviews work-related day care policies and programs at all levels of government, (3) provides an analysis of key issues, including advantages and disadvantages to users and sponsors, and factors affecting the development of work-related programs, and (4) identifies significant implications for future policy and program development. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283591

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Minister of Supply + Services Canada

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Child Care: The Employer's Role

Prepared for

The Task Force on Child Care

© Minister of Supply and Services Canada, December 1985
Cat. SW43-1/4-1985E
ISBN: 0-662-14406-6

Texte également publié en version française

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SERIES 4: CHILD CARE: THE EMPLOYER'S ROLE

Foreword

Paid Parental Leave Policies: An International Comparison, with Options for Canada
Monica Townson 1

A Study of Work-Related Day Care in Canada
Rothman Beach Associates 58

List of Publications in Series 137

FOREWORD

The Task Force on Child Care commissioned a series of research studies designed, for the most part, to provide detailed analyses of selected issues of special relevance to child care and parental leave policies and their effects on the changing Canadian family.

The terms of reference for the Task Force called for an examination and assessment of the need for child care services and paid parental leave in Canada, and of the adequacy of the current system in meeting the perceived needs. Most of the research reports, therefore, were designed to pull together and analyze information from existing sources. However, in a number of instances, it was necessary to initiate primary research because of the absence of data in the area. Parents' Needs, Preferences, and Concerns About Child Care: Case Studies of 336 Canadian Families, and The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market are two such studies.

While these studies incorporate a wealth of useful information, which provided the Task Force with the basis on which to develop its arguments and recommendations, they are reflective of the views of the authors, and should not be interpreted as representing the views of the Task Force. Furthermore, the studies do not reflect the policy or the intentions of the Government of Canada.

Status of Women Canada makes these research reports available to groups, organizations and individuals wishing to explore in greater depth the Task Force report and issues relating to child care and parental leave. This reflects the department's objective of providing a broad basis for public discussion of issues relating to the equality of women in Canadian society.

Other papers published in this series are listed at the back of this publication. Copies of these papers are available by writing to:

Status of Women Canada
Communications Unit
151 Sparks Street, Suite 1005
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1C3

PAID PARENTAL LEAVE POLICIES:

AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON, WITH OPTIONS FOR CANADA

by MONICA TOWNSON

A study prepared for the Task Force on Child Care, January, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 4

1.1 The Evolution of Maternity and Parental Leave Policies 5
1.2 The Philosophical Basis for Maternity Benefits and Paid Parental Leave 7
1.3 Recent Developments in Paid Maternity Leave 8
1.4 Where Canada Stands 8
1.5 Outline of the Report 10

2.0 PAID MATERNITY AND PARENTAL LEAVE PROGRAMS IN OTHER COUNTRIES 10

2.1 Planned Economies 11
2.1.1 Bulgaria 12
2.1.2 Czechoslovakia 13
2.1.3 German Democratic Republic 14
2.1.4 Hungary 15
2.1.5 The Soviet Union 16
2.1.6 Yugoslavia 18
2.2 The Nordic Countries 19
2.2.1 Denmark 20
2.2.2 Finland 21
2.2.3 Norway 22
2.2.4 Sweden 23
2.3 The European Economic Community 25
2.3.1 Belgium 27
2.3.2 France 28
2.3.3 Federal Republic of Germany 29
2.3.4 Greece 29
2.3.5 Ireland 29
2.3.6 Italy 30
2.3.7 Netherlands 30
2.3.8 United Kingdom 31
2.4 Other Countries 31
2.4.1 Austria 31
2.4.2 Iceland 32
2.4.3 Israel 32
2.4.4 Portugal 32
2.4.5 Spain 32
2.5 The United States 33

3.0 PAID MATERNITY AND PARENTAL LEAVE IN CANADA 34

4.0 PAID PARENTAL LEAVE OPTIONS FOR CANADA 37

4.1 The Design of a Parental Leave Program 38

5.0 THE COSTS OF THE RECOMMENDED OPTIONS 41

5.1 Funding an Expanded Program for Paid Parental Leave 45
5.2 The Cost of Other Parental Leave Options 47
5.3 The Cost of Replacing Absent Employees 48
5.4 Conclusions 49

NOTES 50

APPENDIX 54

BIBLIOGRAPHY 56

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Most mothers in Canada now work outside their homes. In fact, most women who are likely to become mothers are also in the paid labour force. Sixty-nine per cent of all Canadian women in their prime childbearing years, that is, between the ages of 20 and 44, participated in the work force in 1983.[1] Contrary to public perception, the majority of women workers in this age bracket had full-time jobs. Only 22% of women in the age group 25-44 worked part-time in 1983,[2] which was the lowest percentage of part-time employment of any group of women workers in Canada.

Perhaps even more significant than the rising participation of women generally, has been the dramatic increase in the labour force participation of mothers with young children. In 1975, only 35% of mothers with pre-school children worked outside their homes. By 1983, 52% of mothers with pre-schoolers participated in the work force,[3] representing a 58% increase in the labour force participation of this group within just eight years. Canada is not alone in this experience. In several industrialized countries, the most dramatic increases in women's labour force participation have come from mothers with very young children.

Lifetime work patterns of women are also changing. In many countries, including Canada, women no longer drop out of the work force when they have children, to remain at home until their children reach school age. Most take a brief period of maternity leave and then return to work. According to one estimate for the United States,[4] more than 41% of all mothers in 1982 were back at work before their child was one year old.

In light of these quite radical changes in women's work patterns, many countries have had to re-examine their policies on maternity leave and child care. Stated national commitments to equality for women were clearly inconsistent with a situation where women in the work force were expected to take an unpaid leave of absence, often with no job protection, for maternity. The United Nations recognized this in developing its Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, to which Canada is a signatory. Bearing in mind "the great contribution of women to the welfare of the family and to the development of society, so far not fully recognized, the social significance of maternity and the role of both parents in the family and the upbringing of children, and aware that the role of women in procreation should not be a basis for discrimination but that the upbringing of children requires a sharing of responsibility between men and women and society as a whole," the signatories agreed in Article 11, clause 2 that:

> In order to prevent discrimination against women on the grounds of marriage or maternity and to ensure their effective right to work, States Parties shall take appropriate measures:
>
> a) to prohibit, subject to the imposition of sanctions, dismissal on the grounds of pregnancy or of maternity leave and discrimination in dismissals on the basis of marital status;
>
> b) to introduce maternity leave with pay or with comparable social benefits without loss of former employment, seniority or social allowances;

c) to encourage the provision of the necessary supporting social services to enable parents to combine family obligations with work responsibilities and participation in public life, in particular through promoting the establishment and development of a network of child care facilities;

d) to provide special protection to women during pregnancy in types of work proved to be harmful to them.

While many jurisdictions, including both federal and provincial jurisdictions in Canada, now have statutory provisions for maternity or parental leave, the extent to which these leaves are compensated varies considerably from one jurisdiction to another. Statutory leave provisions, with job protection and other guarantees are, of course, a necessary first step in preventing discrimination against women on the grounds of marriage or maternity and in ensuring their right to work. But unless such leaves are paid, some workers may be unable to avail themselves of the provisions, or may suffer financial hardship if they do.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) set out minimum standards in its Maternity Protection Convention (Revised) 1952 (No. 103) which were endorsed in the Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers, adopted by the ILO at its 60th Session in 1975. They were recommended as standards to be applied to all women workers without exception. As well as a minimum leave period and protection against dismissal for women workers on maternity leave, the ILO Convention 103 provides as a minimum standard that "cash benefits during the leave be sufficient for the full and healthy maintenance of the child, to be provided by means of social insurance or public funds."

The minimum standard of 12 weeks maternity leave is related directly to the need for the physical recovery of the mother from childbirth. Many countries go beyond this minimum standard, providing longer leaves which allow mothers (and sometimes fathers) to withdraw from the labour force to care for their children, while retaining various employment rights.

1.1 The Evolution of Maternity and Parental Leave Programs

In response to changing work patterns, countries have developed a variety of paid leave programs to meet the needs of working parents and their children. These programs may be grouped into four broad categories:

i) Maternity/Paternity leave. Leave at, or around, the time of childbirth may be given to mothers to allow them to prepare for or to recover from the birth of a child. Some countries require that a certain number of paid weeks leave be taken before the expected birth and a certain number afterwards. In the case of adoption, maternity leave may be given to enable the parent to welcome a new child into the home. Paternity leave may be taken by the father immediately after the birth (or adoption) of a child or, in some cases, where there are medical complications, paternity leave may be available before the birth.

The intent of this type of paternity leave, of course, is to allow the father to assist the mother or to be with the mother and newborn infant. The leave may thus be of relatively short duration, sometimes only for a few days following the birth or adoption of a child. Countries such as Sweden, which have an extensive program of parental benefits, enabling parents to share care and responsibility for their children, nevertheless require that mothers take a minimum period of paid leave immediately following the birth of a child, in order to protect the health of the mother.

ii) Extended maternity/paternity leave, to enable mothers or fathers to care for a child still in infancy. This type of leave goes beyond the minimum time required to allow the mother to recover from the birth of a child. The length of the leave may vary from four to six months. For example, in Sweden, up to six months paid leave is available to either parent and must be used before the child is 270 days old. In those countries which provide this type of leave, it is usually regarded as a way of enabling parents to be with their newborn children, to facilitate adjustment to the new family member and to promote bonding between parent and infant.

iii) Child care leave and special rights for parents. Some countries provide special leave for parents to care for very young children (under age three) who are not yet old enough to go to nursery school or kindergarten. Hungary's child care grant, for example, is designed to provide a strong incentive for mothers to stay at home to care for their own children until the child reaches the age of three. The policy (described in more detail below) was initiated, at least partly, because there were doubts about the impact of Hungary's existing group day care on very young children and an inability of the state to meet the costs of high-quality group care for children under three. The policy is thus a clear attempt to substitute home care by the child's mother for community-provided group child care.

While benefit levels for maternity and extended maternity leave are usually set in relation to salary, benefits for child care leaves are often paid on a flat rate basis, regardless of previous earnings.

Some countries have also adopted special provisions for working parents that allow them to spend more time with their young children on an ongoing basis. For example, under the Swedish parental insurance program, a special parental allowance gives the equivalent of six months paid leave of absence to either parent to stay at home to care for a child. The leave may be taken in the form of shorter working hours (a six-hour working day or half-days off) and may be taken at any time up to and including the child's first year at school at the age of eight.

iv) Leave for workers with family responsibilities. This category of paid leave includes leave for working parents to deal with emergency situations, such as the illness of a child or of the child's usual care-giver. In some countries, such leave may include paid time off for parents to fulfil responsibilities for their children's education, for example, through attendance at school functions and meeting with the child's teachers.

1.2 The Philosophical Basis for Maternity Benefits and Paid Parental Leave

The particular combination of paid leaves and benefits provided to working parents in any country reflects very closely national views of the role of women in society and the role they are expected to play in the economy. In fact, in all countries, whether they are planned economies or market economies, maternity benefits and paid parental leaves constitute a powerful policy instrument by which particular social goals in relation to women's employment can be achieved.

Some countries provide strong financial incentives for mothers to stay at home to care for their own children, at least for the first year or two of the child's life. Such policies may be founded on a variety of philosophical premises or policy objectives. There may be a strong societal belief that "a woman's place is in the home"; there may be an unwillingness or inability to provide widely-accessible, community- sponsored day care; economic conditions may be such that policy makers wish to discourage women from being in the labour force; there may be concern about the impact of child care on very young children.

Some countries give enhanced benefits for second and subsequent children, in an effort to encourage women to have more children. Maternity leave provisions in many of the eastern European countries, for instance, where fertility rates are extremely low, have been designed with this objective in mind.

The need for a sharing of family responsibilities between both parents is receiving increasing recognition as two-earner families become the norm in a growing number of countries. Indeed, in 1981, the ILO adapted its Convention on "Women with Family Responsibilities," passed in 1965, to cover "Workers with Family Responsibilities." The Convention provides that "with a view to creating effective quality of opportunity and treatment for men and women workers, each member should make it an aim of national policy to enable persons with family responsibilities who are engaged or wish to engage in employment to exercise their right to do so without being subject to discrimination and, to the extent possible, without conflict between their employment and family responsibilities."

In a growing number of countries, there is recognition that equality for women in the work place cannot be achieved unless domestic labour is also shared between women and men. This is the basis for the parental leave programs in most of the Nordic countries, where paid leave is structured in such a way that mothers and fathers may share in the care of their children, and domestic labour is not considered to be something that only women workers must combine with paid work.

Whatever the philosophical basis for a particular program or combination of programs, it is clear that there may be an impact on such variables as birth rates, labour force participation of women, provision of day care and the sharing of family responsibilities between men and women.

1.3 Recent Developments in Paid Maternity Leave

Most industrialized countries, and even a number of less developed ones, now have national programs which provide cash benefits during maternity leave. The United States is a major exception. It still has not ratified the ILO Convention 103 and has no general scheme for maternity leave. Most large U.S. employers, however, do allow time off, with reinstatement rights, for maternity. Private disability insurance coverage, available through the employee benefits programs of some employers, provides income replacement for some women who take maternity leave. And in five states (California, Hawaii, New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island) there is temporary disability insurance for workers that provides state benefits for the six-to-eight-week leave period that women require to recover from childbirth. However, it has been estimated[5] that only 40% of working women in the United States are entitled to paid disability leave of at least six weeks at the time of childbirth.

Among the 24 western industrialized countries which are member states of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Australia and New Zealand are also exceptions. Although New Zealand introduced a statutory period of six months unpaid leave in 1981,[6] there is no maternity cash benefit. Unsupported (single-parent) pregnant women and mothers can receive cash benefits, however. Australia has no general scheme for maternity leave, nor does it have a national maternity benefit program. Paid leave is available to some employees, most of whom work for government.[7]

1.4 Where Canada Stands

In Canada, maternity benefits have been available through the Unemployment Insurance program since 1971. Benefits equivalent to 60% of the mother's usual earnings (up to a maximum insurable earnings limit) are paid for 15 weeks to qualified applicants. Until January 1984, when the regulations were changed in some respects, qualification requirements were so stringent that the majority of working mothers were excluded from benefits. In fact, officials within the Department of Employment and Immigration estimated that until 1984, only about 45% of working women who were potentially eligible for maternity benefits actually received them.[8]

On the international level, Canada's program compares unfavorably with those of other countries. In terms of benefit levels, Canada ranks 22nd out of 23 countries in eastern and western Europe. Paid maternity leave provisions of the 23 countries are shown in Table 1. For each benefit level, countries are listed according to the length of leave given, with those giving the longest leave listed first. Countries giving flat rate benefits, unrelated to earnings, have been excluded from the list. In addition to paid leave immediately following the birth of a child, many countries have other types of paid leave for parents. Specific details are discussed in Section II below.

Table I

Paid Maternity Leave Provisions in Selected Countries

Country	Date of Most Recent Information	Length of Leave	Different Benefits For Second and Subsequent Children	Available to Fathers[a]
Benefit Level at 100% of Earnings[b]				
German Democratic Republic	1984	6 months	X	X
Hungary	1984	5 months	X	X
Yugoslavia	1984	4-8 1/2 mths.		X
Bulgaria	1984	4 months	X	X
Norway	1984	4 months		X
Austria	1982	16 weeks		
Soviet Union	1984	16 weeks		
Federal Republic of Germany	1982	14 weeks		
Portugal	1982	3 months		
Netherlands	1982	12 weeks		
Benefit Level at 90% of Earnings				
Sweden	1984	9 months		X
Czechoslovakia	1984	6 months	X	X
Denmark	1984	24 weeks		X
France	1982	16 weeks		
United Kingdom	1982	6 weeks		
Benefit Level at 80% of Earnings				
Finland	1983	11 months		X
Italy	1982	5 months		
Belgium	1984	14 weeks		
Ireland	1982	14 weeks		
Benefit Level at 75% of Earnings				
Spain	1982	14 weeks		
Israel	1982	12 weeks		
Benefit Level at 60% of Earnings				
Canada	1984	15 weeks		
Benefit Level at 50% of Earnings				
Greece	1982	12 weeks		

Source: Specific sources of information for each country are listed in the detailed review of various countries presented in Section II of this report.

Notes: a This column indicates all countries which make any paid leave available to fathers. In most cases, fathers are entitled only to the extended part of the leave (for which flat-rate benefits are provided) and which follows the initial leave with earnings-related benefits shown in the first two columns of the table.

b For the purposes of maternity leave provisions, most countries set a maximum limit on earnings that can be used in calculations of benefits. In Canada, for example, maximum insurable earnings in 1985 is $460 a week and maximum benefits are 60% of this amount, or $276 a week.

1.5 Outline of the Report

This report is intended to provide a basis for the development of paid parental leave policies in Canada. It reviews maternity and paid parental leave programs in other countries, including such options as paid leave on the birth or adoption of a child, shorter working hours for parents, extended leaves for child care by the child's own parents, and special leave for family-related responsibilities.

The report will review the provisions for paid parental leave that currently exist in Canada, taking into account statutory benefits available through the Unemployment Insurance program as well as touching on private arrangements for fully paid parental leave, such as those negotiated by some trade unions through collective bargaining.

Finally, the report recommends paid parental leave options for Canada, developing a cost analysis of these options for application in the Canadian context, with proposals for financing of the programs.

2.0 PAID MATERNITY AND PARENTAL LEAVE PROGRAMS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

For the purposes of this report, paid maternity and parental leave policies in 24 countries were studied. In 23 of those countries, cash benefits are provided by means of social insurance or public funds, as set out in ILO Convention 103. The one exception is the United States, which, as mentioned above, has no national system of paid maternity or parental leave. However, for the purposes of comparison, information about the way in which maternity leave is dealt with in the United States is included in this section.

Although the structure of the programs varies considerably from one country to another, there are certain basic similarities between countries having similar socio-economic systems. Countries have therefore been arranged in four broad groupings:

i) planned economies, such as the Soviet Union, eastern European countries and Yugoslavia
ii) the Nordic countries
iii) countries of the European Economic Community (excluding Denmark, which is included with the Nordic countries)
iv) Other countries, including the United States

2.1 Planned Economies[9]

The socio-economic system of the planned economies is such that women are encouraged, and indeed expected, to be in the work force. A high percentage of adult women therefore work outside their homes. Women constitute 51% of the work force in the Soviet Union, for example,[10] and in the German Democratic Republic, 89% of adult women were employed in 1983 -- one of the highest female participation rates in the world.[11]

Child care and maternity leave provisions reflect this reality. However, they also reflect the reality that in many of the planned economies (as in many western countries) child care and family responsibilities are considered almost exclusively a women's preserve. While most of these countries have generous benfit programs, until recently they were available only to mothers. This fact reinforces the potential for using maternity benefit programs as an instrument of pro-natalist policy and a way of determining women's labour force choices and employment options.

Several countries have recently made parts of the paid leave available to fathers as well as mothers. In most cases, while leave immediately following the birth of a child is given only to mothers, either parent may take a period of extended leave to care for the very young child. In most cases, however, the policy seems to have been designed less as a way of encouraging fathers to share in family responsibilities and more as a way of making paid leave available to fathers in the case of some unforeseen eventuality, such as the illness of the mother, or her death in childbirth.

As well, benefits are often structured in such a way as to make it unlikely that many fathers will claim them. Maternity leave, immediately following the birth of a child, is customarily available at full salary. But the extended leave period, for which fathers are also eligible, is usually paid on a flat rate basis. And benefits are often set rather low, so that men (who have higher average earnings than women) and even higher-earning women, may not be able to afford to take the full leave.

A number of countries have made changes in their programs recently, with some changes to take effect in 1985. In some cases, the changes are designed to give greater benefits to working mothers having a second or third child, and countries freely admit that their objective is to increase the birth rate.

In several cases, paid leave policies in the planned economies have moved in the direction of longer paid leaves, clearly designed to encourage mothers to stay at home longer to care for their children themselves, often until the child is two or three years old. Some countries explain these changes in terms of having second thoughts about the effect of group day care on very young children. However, there may be other reasons.

Many of the planned economies lost almost an entire generation of adult males during World War II. As a result, women were expected to undertake work that in many western countries is still considered "men's work". Just as, in Canada, women who undertook a wide variety of non-traditional jobs during the war were expected to return to more traditional roles once their men came home, so perhaps some of the planned economies may be revising their views on the role of women in the work force now that a new generation of males has reached working age. This possibility, coupled with the fact that the planned economies have been experiencing slower economic growth during the recent past, may be behind some of the recent changes in paid maternity leave programs.

Paid leave programs in six of the planned economies are reviewed below.

2.1.1 Bulgaria[12]

As a result of a decision by the Council of Ministers in April 1984, a number of changes will be made to Bulgaria's maternity leave programs, to come into effect on July 1, 1985. Paid leave will now be available for parents to look after a child until the child reaches the age of two. (Previously the maximum length of paid leave was 10 months for the first child, longer for second and subsequent children.) Leave will also be extended to fathers as well as mothers for the first time, which Bulgarian representatives describe as affording a "real possibility for distributing responsibility between both parents."

Once the changes come into effect, Bulgaria's program will have five main elements:

i) Maternity leave, which is only available to biological mothers. A woman must stop work 45 days before the expected birth of her child. If the child is born prematurely, the balance of the 45- day period may be taken after the birth. Total maternity leave will be 120 days for the first child, 150 days for the second, and 180 days for the third. The mother receives full salary while she is on leave.

ii) Extended leave, until the child reaches the age of two, may be used by either the father or the mother, or even by the grandparents of the child. According to Bulgarian sources, for professional women "a prolonged period away from work due to pregnancy and childbirth might have a detrimental effect on their qualifications and hinder their professional development and advancement." For this reason, the leave may be claimed by fathers or grandparents instead of the mother. Pay during the extended leave period is at the rate of the minimum national monthly salary (equivalent to minimum wage in Canada).

iii) The mother or father is entitled to continue on leave until the child reaches the age of three, in which case she or he is paid 10% of the minimum wage. In all cases, the parent's job is protected until she or he returns to work. Enterprises have no right to change the conditions of work or salary while the parent is on leave and the leave period counts as pensionable service.

iv) Parents are also entitled to 60 days off between them each year (shared however they wish) to care for children up to the age of 16 if they are sick. For children up to the age of 9, benefits are 100% of salary, for older children, the benefit is equivalent to the amount of sick pay the parent would receive if she or he were ill. Parents may take unpaid leave for longer periods, where children are ill for extended periods of time, and the leave counts towards pensionable service.

v) In addition to the above leaves and benefits, cash benefits are paid to parents on the birth of a child, and there are monthly allowances for children, similar to Canada's family allowances. In both cases, higher benefits are paid for second children and significantly higher benefits for third children. Young families are also entitled to housing allowances and parts of the repayment are waived according to how many children the family has.

2.1.2 Czechoslovakia[13]

Czechoslovakia has also recently made changes to its maternity benefit and paid leave programs, which came into effect on January 1, 1985. Paid leave has been lengthened to allow mothers to stay home with a first child until the child is one year old. Under the present system, mothers in two-parent families are entitled to 26 weeks of leave at 90% of salary on the birth of a first child. Single-parent mothers get 35 weeks of paid maternity leave for a first child.

Mothers who have a second child are entitled to 26 weeks of leave at 90% of net, untaxed wages, plus another 18 months at a fixed benefit rate of 600 krona a month. (The average general wage is about 2780 krona a month, so the fixed rate benefit for the extended part of the leave represents about 22% of the average wage.)

Leave for the birth of a second child will remain the same, but as of January 1, 1985, paid leave on the birth of a first child will consist of 26 weeks at 90% of net, untaxed wages, followed by an additional 26 weeks at 600 krona a month. Czechoslovakian sources say there are now "reservations about the impact of crèches" on very young children, although young mothers who are still completing their obligatory period of education, may have their children cared for by the crèche. Czechoslovakian sources say that "at the present time, roughly 20% of all children under the age of three are accommodated in crèches which fully meet the requirements of families as the majority of women prefer to obtain the maternal allowance paid to mothers of at least two children, of which one is under the age of two and stay at home for that period." Nevertheless, it would appear that highly qualified women may prefer to continue working.

Either the mother or the father will now be able to take the extended part of the paid leave, but the rather low level of the flat rate benefit would seem to make it unlikely that many fathers will avail themselves of this option.

Sixty per cent of children in Czechoslovakia are born to mothers under the age of 25, and the remaining 40% are born to mothers under 30. It is apparently very unusual for women over 30 to become mothers. Kindergartens accommodate 91% of all children of age three to six, and primary school starts at age six. It would appear, then, that home care by the child's own mother is encouraged until the child is almost three years old.

In addition to the above paid leaves, a mother is entitled to remain at home for up to five days at full pay if her child is sick, and this may be extended with the agreement of the trade union at her place of work.

2.1.3 German Democratic Republic[14]

In May 1984, a joint resolution on measures to improve the working and living conditions for families with three or more children was passed by the Central Committee of the Socialist United Party, the Free German Federation of Trade Unions and the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The resolution, implementing resolutions made at the Tenth Party Congress, was to take effect on June 1, 1984. Again, the general direction of the changes is to extend the period of post-natal leave to encourage mothers to stay at home for longer periods to care for their own children, and to make special provisions for mothers who have three or more children. Prior to 1984, some paid leave provisions were available only to single-parent mothers and not to mothers in two-parent families.

The main elements of the paid maternity programs in the GDR are now as follows:

i) On the birth of her first child, a working mother is entitled to 26 weeks of leave at full salary. (The period of maternity leave was increased from 18 to 26 weeks in 1976.)

ii) On the birth of a second child, the leave provisions are 26 weeks at full salary (average net pay), followed by a further 26 weeks on fixed benefits equivalent to the amount the mother would receive if she herself were sick. (It would appear that sick pay for workers is fixed by law in much the same way as minimum wages are established in Canada. Workers who are away from work because of illness are allowed seven weeks of leave at full pay, after which they transfer to sick benefits.) The amount of the flat rate benefit for extended leave is to be not less than 350 marks a month, and, in the case of mothers who are employed part-time, the benefit will be pro-rated.

iii) On the birth of a third and any subsequent child, mothers will be entitled to the basic 26 weeks at full salary, followed by an extended leave on fixed benefits until the child reaches the age of 18 months.

iv) Mothers with two or more children are also entitled to longer annual leaves than other workers. While the basic annual paid holiday is 18 working days, mothers who work full time in the multi-shift system (that is irregular shifts rather than standard weekly hours), with two dependent children under age 16, get 20 working days' leave a

year. Annual holidays for working mothers on standards shifts, with three children up to age 16 living in the same household, are 21 days, with those in the multi-shift system entitled to 23 working days' leave a year.

v) Mothers with three or more children, who must stay at home to look after a sick child, receive 90% of average net income for up to two working days, after which benefits are equivalent to the legally fixed sick pay. (Until May 1984, this benefit was available only to single mothers and not to married women.) These benefits are available for a combined total of 8 weeks per calendar year for mothers with three children; for 10 weeks for mothers with four children; and for 13 weeks for mothers with five or more children. In justified cases, these provisions also apply to the father or grandmother of the child if either of these persons is caring for the child because the mother cannot do so herself.

vi) Single mothers working full time who cannot find a place in a crèche for their children and who therefore have to interrupt their employment temporarily, are entitled to a monthly benefit equivalent to the legally fixed sick benefit.

vii) Mothers working full time with two or more dependent children under age 16 are entitled to a shorter work week (40 hours) with no loss in pay.

viii) Other cash benefits include a lump sum benefit of 1000 marks on the birth of every child, and child allowance of 20 marks a month per child for the first two children and 100 marks each per month for the third and any further child. As well, child care facilities operate free of charge, although the parents pay a small percentage of the cost of meals.

2.1.4 Hungary[15]

In Hungary, 80% of adult women participate in the work force and about 90% of children are born to working mothers. Since 1967, Hungary has had a child care allowance program which provides a strong incentive for mothers to stay at home to care for their own children until the child reaches the age of three. The success of the program (in keeping mothers of young children at home) is evidenced by the fact that only 17% of children under the age of three are cared for in crèches, and only about 33% of mothers of children under age three are in the work force.[16]

More than 87% of children between the ages of three and six are in nursery school or kindergarten.

Maternity leave, as it is now structured, consists of 20 weeks at full pay, following the birth of a child, followed by an extended leave, with benefits paid at a flat rate, until the child is three years old. The monthly cash benefit is fixed at a flat rate of 1100 florins, which is about one-third of the average wage. Because of the low benefit level, few highly qualified women take advantage of it. As well, they are apparently reluctant to drop

out of the work force for three years because of the effect it might have on their careers. According to Hungarian sources, "During this time they can be left behind in the technical-technological development in their places of employment, and their communal links can loosen."

Extended leave benefits have been available to fathers since 1982, but in light of the benefit level (and for other reasons discussed above), it may be assumed that few fathers take the leave.

There is job protection for mothers on child care leave, and when the mother decides to return to work, the employer must give her back the job she held before. She is also entitled to whatever pay increases were given to other workers (doing the same work) during her absence.

Hungarian representatives say that "the advantage of the child care allowance is that it lays the foundation of the development of the child's personality and also enriches the emotional experience of the mother."

Hungary is in the process of revising its parental leave program and the government is preparing regulations which will increase the length of the leave. The changes will be part of a review of the entire system of child care allowances. Another proposal likely to be enacted by the end of 1985 is to change the benefit level for the extended part of the leave from a flat rate benefit to a percentage of the mother's usual earnings.

Under the present system, mothers who usually work part-time and then take child care leave are entitled to the full amount of the flat rate benefit. A mother who takes time off work to care for a sick child is entitled to benefits for a period of up to three months each year for a child under age three, and up to one month each year for a child between the ages of three and six. The amount of the benefit is the same as the mother would receive if she herself were ill.

The importance of the sharing of domestic labour was emphasized as a rationale for the 1982 changes in the Family Act, when child care benefits were made available to fathers as well as to mothers. Hungarian sources say that younger couples are much more likely to accept this philosophy than older couples "who persist in the belief that providing for the family and educating the children is exclusively a task and a responsibility of the mother."

2.1.5 The Soviet Union[17]

Maternity benefits and paid leaves in the Soviet Union were upgraded in 1981-82 when the government introduced additional leaves of absence for working women with two or more children; increased material assistance to unmarried mothers; introduced partially paid leaves of absence for working mothers to look after a child up to the age of one year; prolonged the unpaid leave of absence until the child is a year and a half old; and introduced a grant on the birth of a child. Further changes were planned for 1984 and 1985 "to rationally combine social and family upbringing of children, to improve the position of working mothers, to narrow the differences in the living standards of families with and without children, and to provide favourable living conditions for young families."

Working women receive a maternity leave of eight weeks before childbirth and eight weeks after at full salary. If the delivery is complicated or the mother gives birth to two or more children, the post-natal leave is extended to 10 weeks.

In addition to the maternity leave, mothers are entitled to a partially-paid leave of absence from work to look after a child until it is a year old, and an unpaid leave until it is 18 months old.

All these leaves are counted in the woman's uninterrupted length of service (pensionable service) and in the duration of work in her specialty. In all cases, she retains her job.

In addition to the usual lunch break and rest periods, working mothers who are nursing their infants are given 30-minute breaks every three hours to do so, or their workday is reduced by one hour, but this hour is counted as working time and the women receive their average pay for it. If she is unable to do her regular job, a nursing mother or a mother with a child less than a year old is transferred to other work but retains her former average earnings while nursing the child or until the child is a year old.

Changes to the system of benefits in 1981 included an additional three-day paid leave and an unpaid two-week holiday for women who have two or more children under 12 and who get an annual paid holiday of less than 28 days; the introduction of a cash grant on the birth of a first child and also on the birth of a second and third child (in addition to the existing grants for a fourth and subsequent children); increased allowances for unmarried mothers for each child and an extension of the payment period until the child reaches the age of 16, or 18 when the child is a student but does not receive a monthly scholarship grant; and better pension benefits for women who have given birth to and brought up five or more children.

In addition, monthly allowances for children are paid to families having a relatively low income level per family member.

The money for various forms of state assistance to families comes from the social consumption funds, and payments to factory, office and professional workers in 1981 amounted to about 38% of their average monthly earnings.

It costs the state about 580 rubles a year to maintain a child in a nursery and about 500 rubles in a kindergarten. Parents are expected to pay 20% of these costs themselves. More than 15 million children were attending pre-school establishments in 1983.

Working mothers may choose a more convenient working schedule when they are bringing up children, especially small children, and if she wishes, a working mother may work a part-time week for a period, which she herself sets, returning to her usual schedule later.

2.1.6 Yugoslavia[18]

Yugoslavia consists of eight republics and autonomous provinces and conditions of maternity benefits and paid leaves vary somewhat from one to another. On a national basis, women constitute 37% of the work force, but women's share in the work force varies from a low of 21% in Kosovo, to a high of 45% in Slovenia.

In the Socialist Republic (SR) of Slovenia, uninterrupted maternity leave lasts 105 days. In the SR of Monetenegro, the SR of Croatia and the Autonomous Province (AP) of Kosovo, leave is 180 days; in the SR of Serbia and the SR of Macedonia, it is 260 days; and in the AP of Vojvodina, it is one year. In addition, the law of Slovenia is the only law which stipulates that if a woman gives birth to two or more liveborn children, or a child with a serious physical or mental handicap, she is entitled to longer uninterrupted maternity leave, in line with the regulations on child care (see below).

After the expiry of the uninterrupted maternity leave, female workers in the SR of Slovenia and the SR of Croatia are entitled to an extended leave period, envisaged primarily for the benefit of the child. The worker herself decides on whether to use this part of the leave, and also decides how she will use it. She may take full leave from work for 141 days (the SR of Slovenia) or up to the child's first birthday (the SR of Croatia) or she may work half the working time until the child reaches one year of age.

With the exception of the SR of Macedonia, in all other republics and autonomous provinces the worker may work half the working hours until the child is eight months or until it reaches one year of age. In all jurisdictions, once the child is one year old, the worker may work four hours a day until the child is three, if the child, according to medical opinion, needs greater care.

During the first part of the leave period (the uninterrupted maternity leave) the worker receives her full salary (usually her average income from the previous calendar year). After that, benefits are paid on a different basis. The amount she will receive depends on the fund accumulated by the particular enterprise where she works. The income of a particular enterprise is managed by the workers, who pay production expenses and social obligations from the fund, distributing money among the workers for personal income and common consumption. A woman who works half-time until her child is one year old is entitled to take part in the distribution of funds for personal incomes during that period. Mothers who work a four-hour day from the first to the third year of the child are entitled to personal income according to effective work.

This system is apparently less than satisfactory. Women workers tend to be concentrated in less profitable sectors of the economy, such as textiles, where personal incomes are lower. As well, sources state, "the low income level in predominantly women enterprises is also explained as a consequence of the additional expenses (employment of new workers) and replacement of women workers on maternity leave, while looking after sick children etc." Efforts are now being made to establish a way of transferring these expenses from the enterprises to the society and to social funds. There is evidently some discussion now about the possibilility of establishing

uniform Yugoslav legislation on maternity benefits and paid leave. According to one source, "needs should be brought into conformity with the available resources which workers allocate for social security needs when distributing the generated income. In addition, problems such as, for example, the extension of maternity leave, should be considered more comprehensively and the fact taken into account that biological reproduction is only an integral part of the expansion of society's productive force and that therefore, the burden of biological reproduction cannot be borne only by the family (or mainly the mother) but that the social care for children should be expanded."

Labour laws in all Yugoslavian jurisdictions give fathers a right to claim the extended part of the maternity leave, if the mother of the child agrees. The father may use the uninterrupted part of the maternity leave only in emergency situations, such as if the mother dies or abandons the child.

2.2 The Nordic Countries

The philosophical basis for maternity benefits and paid parental leave in the Nordic countries is one which the Swedish government once acknowledged "appears revolutionary and unrealistic in the eyes of the representatives of many other countries."[19] Sweden articulated its stand quite specifically in a 1968 report to the United Nations which stated that:

> ...every individual, irrespective of sex, shall have the same practical opportunities, not only for education and employment, but also in principle the same responsibility for the upbringing of children and the upkeep of the home.... The view that women ought to be economically supported by marriage must be effectively refuted....the husband's traditional obligation to support his wife must be modified to constitute a responsibility, shared with her, for the support of the children. This concern for the children should also be manifested in a greater degree of participation in the supervision and care of the children on the husband's part.[20]

All the Nordic countries reviewed here have a strong commitment to encouraging the sharing of domestic labour between parents, which is seen not only as an essential development for the achievement of equality for women, but also as a vital element in the welfare of the child.

The extensive program of parental benefits in Sweden has long been held up as a model for policy development on paid parental leave in other industrialized countries, and while official efforts to encourage men to share in domestic labour have had only limited success, nevertheless, the policy is structured in such a way that the involvement of both parents is possible. Program design in many other countries (including Canada) sets up effective barriers to such sharing by specifying that benefits are payable to mothers only. Kamerman and Kahn (1981)[21] have pointed out that "the Swedes are convinced that it is beneficial for women, their husbands and their children if women work, and Swedish policies are designed to encourage this." Policies in the other Nordic countries are based on much the same premise, and there is also a belief that the fact that men are also entitled to the leave helps prevent discrimination against women both in the workplace and in the home.

It is worth pointing out that while high percentages of women in the Nordic countries participate in the work force, very high percentages of working women are employed in part-time jobs (except for Finland). In 1981, 69% of adult women (aged 15-64) participated in the work force in Finland, 72% in Denmark, 64% in Norway, and 75% in Sweden.[22] In the same year, only 8% of employed women in Finland worked part-time; in Denmark 44% of women workers had part-time jobs, in Norway 54% of women worked part-time, and in Sweden 46% of women workers had part-time jobs.[23] By way of comparison, in the same year, 32% of employed women in Canada and 24% in the United States worked part-time. (Part-time work is defined as normal hours of work that are less than 30 hours a week in Canada and Finland, and less than 35 hours a week in Norway, Sweden and the United States. In Denmark, part-time workers are those who declared themselves to be part-time when the survey was taken.)

There is no clear explanation for the high percentage of women who work part-time in most of the Nordic countries. In the case of Sweden, for instance, it has been claimed that the tax system makes it "economically advantageous for the family as a whole if the woman works part-time rather than full-time."[24] In any event, the extent of part-time work may have some bearing on the way in which paid parental leave is utilized.

2.2.1 Denmark[25]

Although Denmark is a member of the European Economic Community (EEC) it is included with the Nordic countries here, since its approach to maternity benefits programs clearly has more in common with other countries of the Nordic grouping than with those in the EEC.

New parental leave measures introduced by Denmark in July 1984 are very much ahead of the field in terms of comparable legislation elsewhere in the EEC. According to one source,[26] the changes are surprising in that they were introduced by a centre-right coalition government committed to making as few legislative changes as possible involving costs for employers. However, the inspiration for the measures came from the Radical Liberals' Party, a political grouping outside the governing Coalition but on which the government parties have relied for back-up support. The parental leave law was essentially the "quid pro quo" for the Liberals' support for the Coalition's controversial budget plans outlined in autumn 1983.

The changes will come into force in two stages: interim leave entitlements were introduced on July 1, 1984, and the changes will be fully operational by July 1, 1985. The reason for the two-stage approach is to limit increased state spending by phasing in the program gradually. The general direction of the changes is to increase the length of the leave and to extend benefits to fathers as well as mothers.

When the changes have all been implemented, paid parental leave provisions will be as follows:

i) Female employees will be entitled to paid leave four weeks before the expected date of birth.

ii) After the birth of the child, the parents will be entitled to 24 weeks leave (20 weeks until July 1, 1985), of which up to 10 weeks (or six weeks until July 1985) may be taken by the father after the 14th week following the birth. Only one of the parents may take the leave.

iii) Fathers will also be entitled to a period of paternity leave of two weeks immediately after the birth of the child.

iv) With the exception of the pre-natal leave period, all the above paid leave provisions will apply to the adoption of a child, regardless of the age of the child. In the case of adoption, there are no restrictions on when the father may take a share of the leave.

Benefits during the leave period will essentially amount to 90% of usual pay (subject to certain maximums), although a rather complicated formula distinguishes between manual and non-manual workers. Before the changes, manual workers received 90% of average earnings in the preceding four weeks (before going on leave), paid from the social security fund. Non-manual workers were covered by 1971 employment legislation which obliged their employers to pay them 50% of their normal wages for a total maternity leave period of five months. The social security authorities made up the shortfall between the employer's payment and the maximum weekly benefit, and reimbursed the employer for the proportion of the benefit he had already paid to the worker.

Under the new system, manual workers will still be able to claim all their benefits (90% of average earnings) through the social security system. Female non-manual employees will still come under the 1971 legislation, receiving benefits for the first five months of the leave in the manner described above. Male employees, who were not included in the 1971 law, will claim all their benefits through the social security system. Sources suggest that this complicated payment system is likely to be streamlined in the near future.

The new legislation specifies how much notice an employee who wishes to take the leave must give to the employer, both before taking the leave and before returning to work. The law does not specify any restrictions on how parents may share the leave and, theoretically, it would appear that it could be split in terms of days, parts of weeks and so on, as the parents choose. In view of the practical problems this might cause for employers, it is expected that this part of the program design will also be clarified soon.

There are apparently no requirements as to length of service for workers who wish to claim paid parental leave.

2.2.2 Finland[27]

Changes to Finland's Sickness Insurance Act in 1981 increased the length of paid maternity leave to 11 months. Paid leave has been available to fathers as well as to mothers since 1978. With the 1981 changes, paid maternity leave is now available for 48 days before the expected date of birth

(previously 24 days) and for 234 days after the child is born. Under certain circumstances, the post-natal leave period can be extended to 300 days' paid leave, plus a further six months without pay but with a guaranteed return to employment.

Fathers may claim six to 12 days' paid leave immediately after the birth of a child and the leave they take is deducted from the total maternity leave period (specified above). As well, after the first 100 days of the mother's maternity leave, the father can opt to take 75 or 100 days of paid leave instead of the mother. When fathers first became eligible for benefits, about 12% of those eligible actually claimed the paid leave. By 1982, that percentage had increased to 21%.

The total period of paid leave for adoption is 234 days.

Benefits are based on the agreed earnings of the worker for the previous tax year and were equivalent to 80% of earnings for the first 100 days and 70% after that, with a maximum daily allowance established at FMK 27.50 ($1 U.S. = 4.60 FMK).

As of April 1983, however, benefits were increased to the equivalent of 80% of earnings for the entire leave period (but they are now treated as taxable income, which was not the case before).

In the public sector, both parents have the right to take time off to care for a sick child, whereas in the private sector, it is usually only women who have that right.

2.2.3 Norway[28]

Over the past decade, paid maternity leave programs in Norway have given rights to fathers to take a paid leave on the birth of a child and also in the event of the child's illness. The Norwegian program now includes the following provisions:

i) Pregnant employees are entitled to leave of absence of up to 12 weeks during pregnancy.

ii) A mother is required to take six weeks leave following the birth of a child, unless she produces a medical certificate showing that it is better for her to resume work.

iii) A father is entitled to two weeks' leave of absence on the birth of a child, provided he lives with the mother and spends the time to take care of the family and home.

iv) Parents are entitled to a further leave of absence during the child's first year of life, provided that the total amount of leave taken jointly by both parents does not exceed one year.

v) Benefits at 100% of usual earnings are paid from the National Insurance Fund for a period of 108 days, not less than 36 of which must be after delivery. A parent must be insured (i.e. contributing to the Fund) and must have been in paid work either as an employee or self-employed for a total of six of the ten months before delivery.

vi) If the mother resumes work before she has received a maternity allowance for 108 days, the benefits for the remaining period are paid to the father, if he is at home and has care of the child. If the child is not in the care of both parents, the allowance may be paid to any person who takes care of the child instead of the parent. Fathers are subject to the same qualifying period for benefits as are mothers, and in addition, a father wishing to claim the paid leave must have been working for not less than 14 days immediately before he takes the leave. A father cannot receive the maternity allowance for more than 72 days.

vii) Mothers (or fathers) who return to work part-time, get a reduced maternity allowance.

viii) Either parent may claim up to ten days per calendar year at 100% of salary to care for a child under age ten who is ill. The leave may also be claimed if the child's usual care-giver is sick.

ix) Single parents, or a parent in a two-parent family where the other parent is disabled or institutionalized, may claim up to 20 days each calendar year to care for children who are ill.

x) Workers with family responsibilities may also be entitled to shorter working hours and the right to refuse overtime, as long as the arrangement does not present a "particular inconvenience for the enterprise."

xi) Mothers who do not meet the requirements for paid maternity leave receive a cash benefit on delivery and there are other cash benefits for single parents in certain circumstances and for children of unemployed parents.

All benefits are paid from the National Insurance Fund. Contributions are made by all workers, based on a pensionable income (in much the same way as Canadian workers must contribute to the Canada Pension Plan or the Unemployment Insurance Program). But all social benefits, including old age pensions, sickness benefits, unemployment benefits, disability pensions, death benefits and parental benefits, are paid from the same fund. To be entitled to cash benefits of any kind, a worker must usually have been working for a minimum of three years. Claims for any kind of benefits, except unemployment insurance, are handled through the local insurance office.

Benefits such as sickness benefits and maternity benefits, which are a percentage of income, are subject to minimum and maximum limits.

2.2.4 Sweden[29]

Three main types of parental allowance are payable in Sweden:

i) Parental allowance, payable to either or both parents on the birth of a child and consisting of 180 days of paid leave at 90% of the parent's usual wage up to a maximum limit. Sixty days of the leave

may be taken before the birth of the child, in which case only the mother is entitled to claim benefits. There is a compulsory period of post-natal leave of 29 days, during which the mother must remain at home (benefits at 90% of usual earnings).

The balance of the six-month leave may be claimed by either parent, and benefits are usually paid to the parent who has the primary responsibility for caring for the child. The 180 days paid leave must be used before the child is 270 days old.

Mothers who are not in the labour force receive a minimum daily benefit for 270 days, providing they had health insurance for at least 180 days before the date of the birth. (Housewives are eligible for health insurance coverage in Sweden.)

In addition to these provisions, fathers are independently entitled to ten days' paid leave on the birth of a child, even if the mother is receiving parental benefits at the same time and for the same child.

ii) A further six months' paid leave which may be taken as full days, half-days or quarter-days off at any time up to and including the child's first year of school at age eight. (A worker who takes a quarter-day off is working a six-hour day.)

Benefits for the first three months of this part of the leave are paid at the same rate as those for the first six months of the parental leave (described in (i) above), that is, at 90% of earnings up to a maximum limit. For the final three months of the leave, there is a flat rate daily benefit.

iii) Each family is also allowed up to 60 days of additional paid leave per child per year if a child or the child's usual care-giver is sick. Benefits are also at the rate of 90% of usual earnings (with the same maximum as other benefits). This part of the leave, which is available only until the child reaches the age of 12, may also be used for other family responsibilities such as health service appointments for the child or visits to pre-school activities in which the child takes part.

Swedish parental benefits are administered by the local insurance office under the supervision of the National Social Insurance Board. They are financed jointly by employers and the government, and no employee contributions are required. Employers pay 75% of the costs through a payroll tax equivalent to 7% of employees' wages up to the maximum insured wage. The remaining 25% of the cost comes from the general revenue of the government. Self-employed persons may contribute on the same basis as employers.

In making use of the first two programs described above, parents must give the employer at least 30 days' notice before starting or concluding the leave. As well, they are not allowed to divide the leave into small irregular blocks of time. Each parent may take no more than two separate periods of leave during each part of the benefit.

When benefits were first extended to fathers in 1974, only two per cent of eligible fathers claimed benefits. By 1984, however, the number of fathers claiming had increased to 22%. On average, these fathers take a total of 46 days off during the child's first year of life. It is far more common for men to take time off to look after sick children, and about half of the paid days off for care for sick children are taken by men. About 80% of all fathers take advantage of the ten days' leave of absence to which they are entitled when the child is born.

There is apparently some dissatisfaction in Sweden with the fact that so few fathers take the parental leave and there has been some suggestion that the law should be changed to specify that the paid leave must be shared equally between both parents. Such a proposal, which would amount to imposing a "quota" of leave for each parent, has been opposed by others on the grounds that circumstances vary so much from one family to another.

In any event, the Swedish government has appointed a working party to look into the situation, with representatives of business, labour and government. It was required to report by the beginning of 1985 with recommendations on "transforming the traditional man's role in favour of equality between the sexes."

2.3 The European Economic Community[30]

The Commission of the European Communities (governing body of the European Economic Community) has developed a series of detailed proposals on paid parental leave, which were formally submitted to the Council of Ministers of the EEC in November 1983. The proposals form part of the EEC's Equality Action Programme and are intended as a community-level Directive to member states.[31]

The proposed parental leave Directive makes a distinction between maternity leave proper (immediately following the birth of a child) and extended leave and benefits in relation to the care of young children (see definitions on pp. 4-6). It argues that the extended leave and benefits constitute terms of employment which should apply equally to men and women workers and which therefore fall within the framework of "working conditions" to which the equal treatment principle of the EEC's 1976 Equal Treatment Directive applies. The European Commission expressed the view that the new parental leave Directive will add further substance to the Community's overall policy on equal treatment between men and women.

In setting out its proposals, the Commission put forward several other arguments as justification for the introduction of standards and guarantees on parental and family leave. It said that sharing of family responsibilities is an essential part of strategies to increase equality in the labour market and to develop general family policies. As well, the Commission argued that parental leave is a form of absence from work which could promote greater flexibility in the organization of working time. It suggested that new parental leave programs might offer a valuable means of work experience for unemployed school-leavers, because they could be taken on as temporary help to replace parents on parental leave.

The Commission was evidently very conscious of the fact that it might be criticised for proposing the introduction of an extensive paid leave program in the present difficult economic climate. However, it said the costs of the planned measures should not be over-estimated. Costs would vary, said the Commission, according to the rate of replacement of workers on temporary leave, and the temporary reduction in the demand for early child-care facilities and services. In addition, the Commission stressed the positive contribution which it believes a paid parental leave program could make "to the overall charge to society of the care and early education of young children." It saw this factor as particularly important at a time when it is necessary "to reassure young workers that their professional life can co-exist with their family responsibilities."

The Commission also expressed concern that parental leave not be seized on as a "discreet way of encouraging the permanent withdrawal from the labour market of working mothers." It therefore suggests clear and specific guarantees for the working parent. But it noted that the way in which parental leave has developed in member countries until now sometimes discriminates against working fathers, and in some cases has been wrongly assimilated into maternity leave. The aim of the new Directive is therefore to establish common statutory provisions throughout the Community. It is intended to apply to all wage-earners -- that is, male and female, full-time and part-time, with leave and benefits for part-time workers given on a pro-rated basis.

The basic proposals of the Directive are as follows:

i) Parental leave should be granted "to enable a working parent to stay at home in order to take sole or principal charge of his or her child." The worker would be required to give the employer adequate notice before taking the leave.

ii) A minimum guaranteed period of at least three months is specified, with longer leaves for single-parent families, or for two-parent families with handicapped children.

iii) The paid leave would be available only until the child reaches the age of two (or five in the case of a handicapped child). The leave should be taken as one continuous period, either on a full-time or part-time basis by agreement between the individual worker and the employer. Leave periods would count as pensionable service for the purpose of social security and other benefits.

iv) Benefits or parental leave allowances should be paid from public funds, to avoid any need for direct payments by employers, which might have a negative influence on the employment of young, temporary replacement workers. The Commission believes the recruitement of unemployed young people as temporary replacements should be encouraged.

v) Workers should also be able to claim a minimum number of paid days off each year for pressing family reasons such as the illness of a child or of the child's usual caregiver. The number of days could be increased for single-parent families and families with three or more

children. The "leave for family responsibilities" would be counted as an additional paid holiday period for the purposes of social security contributions, allowances and so on.

vi) The Directive does not specify the level of benefits for the parental leave period, but it suggests they should be adequate to induce either parent to take up the leave option in the interests of the child.

As with the EEC's other equality Directives, there are provisions to safeguard workers against victimization if they exercise their new rights. Specifically, the Directive states there should be protection "against dismissal by the employer as a reaction to any steps taken by the worker aimed at enforcing compliance with the provisions of the Directive."

No time table was proposed for the implementation of the Directive, but it was suggested that member states should have at least four years to comply with its terms and make the necessary arrangements. Once it is implemented, member countries would be required to report back to the Commission every three years. Regular information would also have to be supplied on the development of public child-care facilities.

Among the countries of the European Economic Community, only Denmark (whose program is discussed in detail above) has a paid parental leave program of the kind envisaged by the EEC Directive. When its extended program becomes fully operational in July 1985, paid leave at 90% of usual earnings (up to a maximum insured earnings limit) will be available to either parent for a period of 24 weeks following the birth of a child. In the other EEC countries, paid leave is available only to mothers. However, the level of benefits is generally good, with the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the Netherlands giving benefits of 100% of usual earnings; France and the U.K. at 80%; Belgium, Italy and Ireland, 80%; and Greece, 50%.

The length of the paid maternity leave ranges from six weeks in the U.K. to five months in Italy. Of the nine EEC countries, only Greece, the Netherlands and the U.K. now give less than the minimum three months paid leave suggested by the EEC Directive.

Existing paid maternity leave provisions of the countries of the EEC (exluding Denmark) are summarized below.[32]

2.3.1 Belgium[33]

There are no general statutory provisions giving entitlement to parental leave for mothers or fathers to look after young children in Belgium. However, the government introduced a bill at the end of 1983 proposing a statutory right to unpaid parental leave of up to six months, to be taken by either or both parents during the year following the birth or adoption of a child. Re-engagement would be guaranteed, and the employees could also opt to work part-time during this period, provided the employer already had a part-time work scheme. Two private member's bills were introduced at the same time. One suggests placing a clear obligation on the

employer to hire workers registered as unemployed to replace those on parental leave. The other bill proposes statutory paid leave of one to two years for parents on the birth of a third child. During the period of leave, the worker's employment contract would be suspended and she or he would be entitled to claim unemployment benefits based on 40% of the standard minimum wage. The employer would also be obliged to replace the worker with someone registered as unemployed.

A special joint committee of Belgium's advisory National Labour Council and the Committee for Women at Work, which includes representatives of unions, employers' organizations and other interest groups, has been studying the three Bills with a view to making recommendations to the Ministry of Labour.

At the present time, however, Belgium's paid maternity leave pays benefits equivalent to 80% of usual earnings for a period of 14 weeks, six of which are to be taken before the expected date of birth and eight after the actual date of confinement. If the worker opts to continue working beyond the sixth week before the expected birth, the unused period of leave may be added to the post-natal leave to give a total of 14 weeks.

During maternity leave, a manual worker receives full pay from her employer for one week, and social security benefits amounting to 79.5% of earnings for the remaining 13 weeks. Non-manual workers receive full pay from their employers for one month, and social security benefits at 79.5% of usual earnings for the balance of the leave.

There is a maximum limit to the amount of the benefit and job protection for mothers on maternity leave. To qualify for benefits, a woman must have contributed to the social insurance scheme for six months.

2.3.2 France

Maternity leave of 6 weeks before the expected date of birth and 10 weeks after the actual confinement may be taken by a worker once she provides a medical certificate to her employer. The leave may be extended by two weeks if the mother has twins or if it is considered necessary for medical reasons. On the birth of a third or subsequent child, the leave period is 8 weeks before the birth and 18 weeks afterwards.

During maternity leave, the mother may claim benefits equivalent to 90% of normal earnings (up to a maximum limit) from the social security fund. There is job protection, under other legislation.

Unpaid leave is available to workers with at least one year's service who wish to stay at home to look after a child under the age of three, but the provision applies only to workers in firms employing more than 100 workers.

To qualify for paid maternity leave, a mother must have been employed for 1200 hours during the previous year, and must have contributed to the social insurance scheme for at least ten months before the expected date of confinement.

Benefits are financed by contributions from employers and employees, with the employer contributing 10.25% of wages up to a specified amount, and 2% after that. Employees contribute 2.5%, then 1%.

2.3.3 Federal Republic of Germany[34]

Maternity leave of 6 weeks before the expected date of birth and, after confinement, up to the date on which the child reaches the age of six months, may be taken by a mother who can provide a medical certificate. Benefits from the general sickness insurance funds are paid on a flat-rate basis during the leave. The amount is fixed at a maximum of DM25 daily. However, during the first 14 weeks of the leave, the employer makes up the shortfall between these benefits and the worker's average net pay level.

There is job protection and the mother must have worked for 12 weeks (in covered employment) between the 10th month and the 4th month before confinement.

Benefits are funded by employer and employee contributions and the government contributes DM400 to the health insurance fund for each beneficiary, plus full payment for at least four months.

The FRG is planning some changes in its maternity benefit program. Small businesses will be able to claim a refund of maternity benefit payments to their female employees, which the government sees as a way of alleviating the high cost burden of benefits on such firms. On January 1, 1986, the government will introduce a "nursing allowance" of up to DM600 a month for the first ten months after the birth of a child. The allowance would be paid to either parent to enable him or her to stay at home to care for the child. The allowance forms part of the "equalization of family burdens" scheme, already adopted by the FRG, and providing tax relief for families beginning in 1986.

2.3.4 Greece

In Greece, a maternity allowance equivalent to 50% of earnings, with a maximum limit, is payable to an insured woman for 42 days before and 42 days after her confinement. To qualify for benefits, the mother must have had 200 days' work resulting in contributions during the previous two years.

Benefits are financed by contributions by employers and employees, with the government contributing an annual subsidy to cover any deficit.

2.3.5 Ireland

Maternity leave of 14 consecutive weeks (to be apportioned as the worker chooses, provided at least 4 weeks are taken before and 4 weeks after the expected week of confinement) may be taken on provision of a medical certificate and with due notification to the employer. An additional 4 weeks may be taken as long as the worker gives adequate advance notice to her employer.

Benefits equivalent to 80% of average earnings during the previous tax year may be claimed through the social security program. A minimum weekly payment is guaranteed.

To qualify for benefits, a women must have paid contributions for 26 weeks in the previous 12 months, or, alternatively, she must have contributed for 26 weeks in the tax year before the calendar year in which the benefit is due to commence.

Benefits are financed by contributions from employers and employees, and the government covers the difference between the amount of the contributions and the cost of benefits.

2.3.6 Italy

Maternity leave of 8 weeks before the expected birth and 12 weeks after the actual confinement may be taken on production of a medical certificate to the employer. If there are medical complications or if a labour inspector determines the work environment is detrimental to the health of the pregnant woman or her child, maternity leave may be started earlier than 8 weeks before the expected date of birth.

Benefits amounting to 80% of normal earnings, up to maximum insured wages, are paid by the social security authorities.

An additional six months of leave at 30% of average wages may be taken up to the child's first birthday. As well, a mother may take paid leave of absence if the child is sick and is under three years of age. These rights to extra leave and time off may be claimed by the father if he has sole custody of the child or if he substitutes for the mother in caring for the child.

Benefits are financed by contributions from employers and employees, with employers contributing between 12% and 17% of insurable earnings (depending on the industrial sector) and employees only 1%. Regions, provinces, communes and other public institutions in Italy also must contribute to the fund.

There is, apparently, no qualifying period for eligibility.

2.3.7 Netherlands

Maternity leave of 6 weeks before the expected date of birth and 6 weeks after may be taken on presentation of a medical certificate to the employer or to the social security authorities. Leave following confinement may be extended if it is "medically necessary."

During maternity leave, workers are entitled to receive their normal pay from the employer, subject to a daily maximum, which the employer can subsequently claim back from the social security authorities.

There are no statutory provisions for any other kind of parental leave, although a national advisory body has been asked to prepare recommendations for possible legislation in the area.

No qualifying contributory period is specified. Benefits are financed by contributions from employers and employees, and the government contributes a fixed annual subsidy (indexed) for general insurance.

2.3.8 United Kingdom[35]

Any woman worker with at least two years' service may take maternity leave of up to 11 weeks before the expected date of birth and 29 weeks after the actual confinement. During the leave, the worker is entitled to six weeks' maternity pay from her employer, based on 90% of normal weekly pay, minus the flat-rate state maternity allowance. The employer can reclaim this in full from the State Maternity Fund. Flat-rate social security allowances are payable for 18 weeks to workers with sufficient insurance contributions. (In other words, the mother gets 6 weeks at 90% of normal wages and 12 weeks of flat-rate benefits.)

There are no statutory provisions for any other kind of parental leave.

Benefits are financed by employee and employer contributions, but the government contributes about 80% of the cost. To qualify, a worker must have had at least 50 weeks in covered employment.

It should be noted that the Fund will pay benefits only to women with at least two years service with the same employer. Employers who choose to give maternity pay to women with less service will not be able to claim any part of the pay from the Maternity Fund. Some employers, particularly in the public sector, give additional benefits to workers on maternity leave, but withhold the payment and make it conditional on the woman's return to work after her leave.

Only women who have had two years' service with the same employer have the right to be re-instated after their maternity leave.

2.4 Other Countries

A number of other countries provide paid maternity leave for varying periods of time. For the purposes of comparison, the programs of five of these countries are summarized below.

2.4.1 Austria

Paid maternity leave (for mothers only) on the birth or adoption of a child, is available for 8 weeks before confinement and 8 weeks after the birth (or 12 weeks in special cases).

Benefits equivalent to 100% of weekly earnings are paid, up to maximum insurable earnings. The government pays 50% of the cost, and employer and employee contributions each provide 25%.

A further year of paid leave is available to all mothers after their paid maternity leave, with benefits on a flat-rate basis. Higher benefits are paid to single mothers than to married women.

To qualify for benefits, mothers must have worked 52 weeks in covered employment during the last two years. For mothers under 21, the qualifying period is 20 weeks.

2.4.2 Iceland[36]

Iceland introduced a parental benefits scheme at the beginning of 1981. Flat-rate benefits, adjusted quarterly to the cost of living, are paid for not more than one month before the birth and two months afterwards. If both parents agree, the father may receive the benefits during the third month.

Parents must have worked 1032 hours or more during the preceding 12 months to qualify. Benefits are scaled down if the length of service is less than this. If the mother is ill, if she gives birth to two or more children, or if the newborn child is sick and needs extra care, the leave may be extended to four months. Adoptive parents and foster parents may claim the leave for a child under the age of five for a period of two months.

2.4.3 Israel

Paid leave at 75% of weekly earnings (in the three months before the leave) is available to natural and adoptive mothers for 12 weeks, including 6 weeks before childbirth. (There is limited entitlement for fathers if the mother dies in childbirth or within one year of the child's birth.)

To qualify, mothers must have worked 10 months in the last 14, or 15 months in the last 22. Benefits are scaled down if they cannot meet these requirements.

Benefits are financed by employer and employee contributions.

2.4.4 Portugal[37]

Paid leave at 100% of previous earnings is available for 90 days. Parental leave for the father or mother to bring up a child was announced in 1982. (No details were available.)

2.4.5 Spain

Maternity leave of 6 weeks before the expected birth and 8 weeks after the actual confinement may be taken on presentation of a medical certificate to the employer. If the worker opts to continue working beyond the sixth week before the expected birth, the leave may be taken after confinement to give a total of 14 weeks.

Workers can claim benefits from the social security authorities equivalent to 75% of the previous month's covered earnings.

Unpaid leave to look after a child up to the age of three may be taken by either the father or the mother. Reduced working hours (with a proportionate reduction in pay) may be taken by a worker who is responsible for the care of a child under the age of six.

2.5 The United States

As already mentioned, the United States has no national program of paid maternity or parental leave and no national statutory provisions for such leaves. Many employers, especially the larger firms, do allow for leaves, and women workers who take maternity leave may be able to claim benefits under the employer's sickness and disability insurance program.

The Pregnancy Discrimination Act, passed in 1978, amended the 1974 Civil Rights Act to provide that "women affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions, shall be treated the same for all employment-related purposes including receipt of benefits under fringe benefit programs as other persons not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work." In other words, where the employer has disability coverage for employees, pregnancy must be included.

U.S. employees were thus faced with the need to provide a replacement income for those on maternity leave (in the same way as those employees on regular sick leave would get sick pay), as well as to make provisions for medical care and hospitalization, which in Canada are covered under the health insurance programs of the provinces.

The Pregnancy Discrimination Act was strongly opposed by both business and the insurance industry on the grounds that the costs of including pregnancy in disability coverage would be too great. But independent cost estimates did not seem to substantiate this claim.[38]

In any case, covering paid maternity leave through disability insurance programs has a number of obvious drawbacks. Both the length of the leave and the level of benefits may be limited. (Most private disability plans in Canada, for example, limit benefits 66 2/3% or at the most, 75% of usual earnings.) As well, there is no possibility of covering fathers, at least in the way that such plans are now structured.

But perhaps the biggest drawback in the disability insurance approach is the lack of coverage. It has been estimated[39] that 60% of working women are not protected by disability coverage through their employers. In addition, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act does not apply to companies with fewer than 15 employees and according to U.S. Bureau of Census statistics, 20% of all employees work in such companies.

Some large U.S. corporations, especially newer high-technology and computer companies anxious to attract workers, do offer paid maternity leaves. And a recent survey of the Fortune 1300 companies revealed that 9% of them offered male employees paternity leave and another 26% were in favour of the idea.[40]

3.0 PAID MATERNITY AND PARENTAL LEAVE IN CANADA[41]

Under most federal and provincial labour laws, women in Canada are entitled to 17 or 18 weeks of maternity leave. Various qualifying periods are specified, and job protection is usually dependent on the worker having satisfied the requirements of the qualifying period. There are no statutory provisions for the leave to be paid. However, maternity benefits have been available through the Unemployment Insurance program since 1971.

Benefits equivalent to 60% of the worker's usual wage are payable for 15 weeks, after an initial two-week waiting period. Maximum insurable earnings for 1985 are $460 a week, so the maximum benefit is 60% of that, or $276 a week. However, because women, on average, earn less than the maximum insurable earnings limit, most receive less than the maximum benefit while on maternity leave. The average weekly benefit paid to those on maternity benefits in 1983, for instance, was $169, which was 73% of the maximum weekly benefit (of $231) available in that year.[42]

The levels established for maternity benefits in the UI program are the same as those for regular unemployment benefits although the qualifying periods are different. To qualify for unemployment benefits, a worker must have been employed and paying contributions for between 10 and 14 weeks in the past 52 weeks, depending on the region where the worker lives. The lower qualifying period applies to areas where there is high unemployment and it might be difficult for a worker to accumulate the requisite number of weeks to qualify for benefits.

To qualify for maternity benefits, however, a woman must have worked for 20 weeks in the past 52-week period. The 20-week qualifying period (or "entry requirement" as it is sometimes called) also applies to those who wish to claim sickness benefits through the UI program. The rationale for the longer qualifying period is apparently to ensure that claimants for benefits other than unemployment benefits demonstrate a "significant work attachment" before making a claim. A federal government Task Force, which reported in 1981, argued that separate entry requirements for different kinds of claims were not justified. It said that "the current 20-week requirement for entitlement to these benefits creates a separate class of claimant and appears to weaken the program's income protection role in these cases. It thus seems to impose on this class of claimant inequities which are even more pronounced in high unemployment areas where the regular entrance requirement is relatively low because of local labour market conditions. It may be justifiable on cost grounds, but it does not meet equity considerations."[43]

The Task Force recommended that the entry requirement for maternity benefits and other special benefits should be the same as that imposed on claimants for regular unemployment benefits. However, at the present time, the qualifying period for maternity benefits remains at 20 weeks.

Other changes to the maternity benefit program were recommended by the Task Force, and these were implemented as of January 1, 1984. Since that date, pregnant women no longer have to work at least 10 weeks around the time of conception (the so-called "Magic 10" rule), they are no longer prevented from getting regular or sickness benefits in the weeks surrounding the birth, and the time in which UI maternity benefits can be claimed is now more flexible.

Prior to these changes, the conditions imposed on maternity benefit claimants were so stringent that the majority of potential claimants did not receive benefits. Officials in the Department of Employment and Immigration estimated that the "take-up" rate for maternity benefits (the percentage of potentially eligible claimants who received benefits) was only 45%.[44] Although it might be assumed that such a low rate was largely attributable to stringent qualification requirements, officials suggested that many potentially eligible claimants did not claim because they were not aware of the program or because they felt there was some stigma attached to the Unemployment Insurance program in general.

Departmental officials believe that since the changes streamlining the program, the take-up rate has probably risen, perhaps to a 50-55% level.

Along with the changes to the maternity benefits program outlined above, another major change instituted on January 1, 1984, was the extension of benefits to adoptive parents. Maternity benefits will now be available on the same terms and conditions outlined above on the adoption of a child. The major significance of this development is that these benefits will be available to either the mother or the father. There is apparently no requirement that both parents be in the work force, so it is apparently possible for a father to claim adoptive benefits, even if the mother is not employed outside the home.

Such distinctions between natural and adoptive parents are likely to be challenged, and it would not be unreasonable to expect some clarification in the near future.

In the first six months of 1984, there were 294 claims for adoption benefits, compared with 67 262 claims for maternity benefits.[45]

The possibility of broadening the concept on which even the existing maternity benefits program is based has been raised by several complaints received by the Canadian Human Rights Commission, some of which have charged that it is discriminatory not to pay benefits to fathers who have to leave work to look after a newborn child when such benefits are available to mothers.[46]

Although the maternity benefits program under UI is the only national program of paid leave for maternity, many Canadian workers do, in fact, have fully-paid maternity (and in some cases parental leave) because they have negotiated it through collective bargaining. This approach was given some prominence as a result of the settlement won by the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) in 1981. The CUPW settlement, reached after strike action, provides for 17 weeks' paid leave at full pay, and the right to an additional 20 weeks unpaid leave.

A number of other unions have successfully bargained for fully- paid maternity or parental leave for their members, including the 200 000 public sector workers in Quebec, representing about one-fifth of that province's female labour force.

A typical formula for such agreements is that the employer pay the worker's full salary during the two-week waiting period imposed by the UI maternity benefits program, and then for the next 15 weeks, tops up UI benefits (which are 60% of salary) to full salary. (In fact, the level is often set at 93-95% of salary to allow for the fact that fringe benefits will be continued during the leave.)

Employers who have agreed to fully-paid maternity or parental leave then establish a Supplemental Unemployment Benefit (SUB) plan, registered with the Unemployment Insurance Commission, so that additional benefits paid by the employer during the leave are not regarded as "earnings" which would have the effect of reducing UI maternity benefits. In any case, benefits received by the employee during the two-week UI waiting period for maternity do not count as earnings for the purpose of the maternity benefit program.

About 1400 employers have registered SUB plans with the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and not all were the result of collective agreements. Some employers have developed plans as a way of paying additional maternity benefits to highly paid management-level women, whose earnings are considerably higher than the maximum insurable earnings limit imposed on UI maternity benefits. Without such plans, these women, who are regarded as valuable employees with a long-term commitment to the employer, would suffer a significant drop in income during the maternity leave period.

It should be noted that employees whose net annual income, including UI maternity benefits and supplements, is more than one and one-half times maximum yearly insurable earnings will have to pay back up to 30% of the UI benefit or 30% of the amount by which their income exceeded the threshold, whichever is the less.[47] This provision was introduced in 1979. The calculation is made at the time the individual income tax return is filed and the "net income" definition is the one specified in the Income Tax Act. The impact of this provision, regardless of whether there is a SUB plan, is that a higher-earning woman gets less than the specified income-replacement ratio from maternity benefits.

In 1984, for example, maximum insurable earnings were $22 100. Anyone earning more than $33 150 (1.5 X $22 100) would have to pay back part of any unemployment or maternity benefits received. A woman whose net income for income tax purposes was $45 000 in 1984, who took 17 weeks of maternity leave, might have received the maximum benefit of $255 a week for 15 weeks, giving her a total of $3825 in maternity benefits. Since her salary is over the threshold amount, she would have to pay back either 30% of her benefits or 30% of the amount by which her income exceeds the threshold, whichever is the less. Since her income exceeds the threshold by $11 850, she would have to pay back 30% of benefits received, or $1147.50. The net benefit received would be $2677.50 or $178.50 a week (for the 15-week benefit period). This is probably equivalent to only 22% of her usual weekly salary of about $800. And it amounts to only 42% of maximum insurable earnings of $425 a week. In other words, higher income earners do not even receive a 60% income replacement ratio on earnings up to the maximum insurable earnings limit.

Whether this is desirable from a policy point of view is an issue that should be given careful consideration in any discussion of expansion of the existing UI maternity benefits program to provide a fully paid maternity or parental leave.

Some collective agreements in Canada do provide for brief periods of paid paternity leave, some offer adoption leave with pay, and some employers allow workers to apply accumulated sick leave credits to a period of absence due to pregnancy. However, these are private arrangements and as such, of course, are not to be confused with the statutory provisions for paid leave such as other countries provide.

It is perhaps worth mentioning here that any plans to change the benefit programs at the national level and under the federal jurisdiction would have to be co-ordinated with statutory leave provisions, which are largely under the jurisdiction of the provinces. Amendments to the British North America Act were required to give the federal government jurisdiction over compulsory insurance programs for unemployment and old age, disability and survivors' pensions. When the UI program was expanded to cover maternity and sickness benefits, no amendment to the Act was sought, but efforts were made to closely link the states of maternity and sickness to the state of unemployment and thus place them within the power of the federal government. The constitutionality of these provisions has never been challenged.

In this respect, it is interesting to note that while the UI program now pays benefits to adoptive parents, adoptive parents have no statutory right to a leave of absence on adoption in most Canadian jurisdictions.

Such jurisdictional questions are beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, they are clearly important in the development of paid parental leave policies in Canada.

4.0 PAID PARENTAL LEAVE OPTIONS FOR CANADA

Labour market policies in Canada have recognized that high levels of female labour force participation are unlikely to be reversed. Policy initiatives to facilitate the full and equal participation of women in the Canadian economy include measures to provide equal pay for work of equal value, equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, special training for non-traditional occupations and various other programs. Yet women are still penalized as a result of their childbearing role. There appears to be a growing recognition that a national system of fully paid leave for childbirth and care of infants is a necessary part of any policy package to support women's labour market participation on a full and equal basis with men. The argument has also been made that women who are breadwinners should not also be expected to shoulder the sole responsibility for child rearing.

In Canada, as in most industrialized countries, the two-earner family is now the dominant family type. It can be expected, therefore, that most adults will spend most of their lives in the paid labour force. The prime labour force thus will increasingly consist of married adults and their children, and policy choices must take this into account.

In most industrialized countries, as we have seen, there is growing recognition that full and equal integration of women into national economic life can be achieved only if it is accompanied by a sharing of family responsibilities between both parents, and that such sharing will be beneficial not only for mothers, but for the children of such families too.

Indeed, it is increasingly being recognized that in some countries, the existing system of leave and benefits discriminates against fathers by denying them the right to take paid leaves and to share in the care and upbringing of their children.

Canada's existing system of maternity benefits compares unfavorably with that of most other major industrialized countries, and there is, at present, no semblance of a national system of paid parental leave in Canada. Necessary initiatives to convert the existing system to the kind of paid parental leave program in existence in many other countries, and one that might meet the minimum standards suggested by the EEC Directive, for example, would include the following steps:

i) An increase in the benefit level. A 60% benefit rate clearly imposes a serious financial penalty on those who take maternity leave. It is extremely low in comparison with other countries. In fact, of 23 countries surveyed for this report and which pay benefits related to the worker's usual earnings, 22 had higher benefit levels than Canada. Only Greece, at a 50% benefit level, provides lower benefits than Canada. Sixteen of the countries paid benefits of 90-100% of usual earnings, and six paid benefits at 75-80%.

ii) To provide equal rights for fathers, and to enable the sharing of family responsibilities between both parents, the paid leave should be made available to either parent. A precedent for this has already been established in Canada, with the extension of maternity benefits to adoptive parents (discussed above). There is no justification for excluding natural fathers from benefits, when adoptive fathers already have access to them.

iii) In light of the fact that the two-earner family is now the typical Canadian family, especially among workers of childbearing age, the program should be adapted to take into account the needs of children. A longer leave period would enable parents to care for their very young children and to establish bonds with their newborn infants. Many adoption agencies, for instance, require that adoptive parents ensure that one parent will remain at home with the child for at least the first six months. A six-month leave period would appear to be a reasonable minimum standard in the interest of the child.

iv) Further provisions should be made to enable parents to combine their paid work with family responsibilities. Such provisions should include paid days off to care for a sick child, and might also eventually include shorter working hours for parents.

4.1 The Design of a Parental Leave Program

The cost of the kind of paid parental leave program outlined above would depend on just how it is implemented. Since Canada already has a national system of maternity benefits, the simplest way to implement the program would be through an expansion of the existing program of benefits provided under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Such a proposal, however, is likely to meet with opposition at the present time, when there is growing

resistance to any expansion of the UI program. In fact, the present government has questioned whether or not maternity benefits should continue to be provided through this program. A recent publication, released in connection with the Minister of Finance's economic statement on November 8, 1984,[48] asks these questions (among others) relating to the existing UI program:

> "On the financing side, for example, should the financial responsibility for job creation, work-sharing costs and maternity benefits be reconsidered?"
>
> "Another departure would be to develop a program component which would be based on insurance objectives and a separate component based on social and redistribution considerations."
>
> "Should more funds be directed to such programs as maternity benefits in order to facilitate a better integration of parenthood and work?"
>
> "Is the distribution of benefits to individuals in the higher-income groups too high?"[49]

It is evident that over the next few months, the existing program of benefits will be subject to review and extensive changes to the program may be expected.

The Unemployment Insurance Task Force, which reported in 1981, concluded that "surveys of public attitudes show broad support for the presence of maternity benefits as part of UI.[50] And a survey carried out in 1980 found that only 11% of those surveyed were opposed to these benefits being paid through the UI program.[51]

There may, however, be some practical difficulties in an expansion of the existing program, with payment of benefits made through the UI scheme. For one thing, the adoption of a higher income-replacement level for parental benefits than that in effect for unemployment insurance might raise questions of equity.

It has been suggested that maternity (or parental) benefits would more appropriately be dealt with by setting up a separate contributory insurance program. However, it might be difficult to secure public support for the idea that all members of society and not just parents or potential parents should contribute to such a fund. A strong case can be made that childbirth and the care of infants is a social risk and thus a societal responsibility and not a private choice for which those who make it should be financially penalized by society. Paid parental leave, which enables parents to combine their work with their family responsibilities, and provides parental care for very young children is of concern to the whole of society, since we need healthy children if we are to survive. It therefore seems appropriate that the cost of paid parental leave should be borne by society as a whole.

Also, the establishment of a separate fund for paid parental leave would involve additional administrative expenses, and would likely prove more costly in this respect than the incremental administrative costs associated with the expansion of the existing program. There might also be constitutional difficulties, as already mentioned.

The separate social insurance fund is one that has been adopted by a number of other countries (as described in more detail in Section II of this report). In most cases, however, employers, employees and the government contribute, in varying proportions, to one fund, from which all benefits such as pensions, unemployment benefits, sickness and disability and maternity benefits are paid. Such a fund would certainly be feasible for Canada, but would require a radical change in Canada's social security system, and might involve constitutional changes as well.

Other alternatives to an expansion of the existing program might include a conditional grant program, under which the federal government would agree to make payments to those provinces that establish programs meeting federal conditions. Legal opinions vary as to whether the federal government can impose conditions such as eligibility criteria, length of leave, and level of benefits, in effect regulating an area which might be considered to be within provincial jurisdiction.

A conditional grant program would imply that the costs of a national parental leave program would be borne jointly by federal and provincial governments. Existing government deficits and criticism of high government spending are likely to make such an option politically impossible.

The same constraints would apply to the suggestion that paid parental leave be financed entirely through the tax revenues of the government, instead of through the contributions of employers and employees as the existing maternity benefits program is funded.

The possibility of tax incentives for employers to establish fully paid parental leave programs is another alternative. There is reason to believe, however, that such an approach would be unlikely to achieve the desired policy objective (of making the program accessible to all workers.) The Parliamentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s examined the question of tax incentives to employers to encourage the implementation of training programs for skilled trades. In a dissenting view of the levy/grant system for skilled trades training, David Orlikow, M.P., pointed out that "300 000 employers -- one-third of all employers -- are in a position where they pay no taxes." He also suggested that while tax incentives could be deferred over a number of years, "such incentives would not be in the best interests of small businesses as cash flow is a problem for such businesses."[52]

Again, an incentive program does not ensure that the paid leave is available to all. Only those whose employers decided to respond to the incentive would have access to the leave.

Jurisdictional constraints would, in all provinces, make it impossible for the federal government to institute the kind of paid parental leave program in effect in some of the countries discussed in Section II of this report, whereby employers are required to provide full pay to employees on maternity or parental leave and are then able to claim a rebate of some part of the payments from the social security authorities.

It is evident that all the alternatives outlined above would require quite radical changes to the existing system, whether they are changes to the present system of social security payments in general, constitutional changes, or new agreements between federal and provincial governments to develop a new and different mechanism to provide a national system of paid parental leave. The dimension of these changes is such that they are beyond the scope of this paper, although further exploration of these options may be warranted.

In light of these considerations, the cost estimates that are developed in the following section are based on an expansion of the existing program of maternity benefits provided under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Such an expansion would be relatively simple from an administrative point of view. As well, it is not impossible to derive some cost estimates of various policy options. Even if such an expansion is not the mechanism by which Canada eventually implements paid parental leave, it will serve for the time being as a reasonable proxy for the costs that would be incurred in providing paid parental leave on a national scale.

5.0 THE COSTS OF THE RECOMMENDED OPTIONS

The cost of expanding the existing maternity benefits program and converting it to a program of paid parental leave will vary widely, depending on what combination of options is chosen and what terms and conditions are imposed. Some possibilities would include the following:

i) An increase in the current benefit level. Ideally, an appropriate rate would be 95%. This would be equivalent to full pay for most workers, once employee benefits are taken into account. An alternative would be 75%, which would be an improvement on the current benefit.

ii) The existing limit of maximum insurable earnings could be retained or abolished. Abolition would mean that parents on leave would get full income replacement with no limits. Retention of the limit would be consistent with other programs, such as Canada Pension Plan benefits.

iii) The qualifying period for maternity benefits could be made the same as that required for regular unemployment benefits -- that is, in January 1985, 10-14 weeks. On the other hand, the entry requirement could remain at 20 weeks.

iv) Benefits could be extended to fathers as well as mothers.

The following tables present cost comparisons of several policy options. For the sake of simplicity, they have been calculated on the basis of benefit levels prevailing in 1985. Costs for subsequent years are thus estimated in 1985 dollars and assume a constant benefit level (that prevailing in 1985). In each case, the cost of retaining the existing income replacement level of 60% of earnings up to the maximum limit was calculated for the purposes of comparison with other options. The other options selected were a 95% replacement level with a limit of maximum insurable earnings, a 95% replacement level up to total earnings (that is, without any limit), and a replacement level of 75% of usual earnings, without limit.

The benefit periods selected were the present 15 weeks, and an extended period of 26 weeks. Whether there would be a two-week waiting period before benefit payments begin is a policy question which does not affect the overall cost of the options considered below.

The possibility of changing the qualifying period for benefits is dealt with in the tables as follows: under the existing program, where the entry requirement is 20 weeks, take-up rates are only about 50%. It might be assumed that if the qualifying period were shortened (and under existing regulations, workers must work only 10-14 weeks to qualify for regular unemployment benefits), then the take-up rate might increase, presumably because more workers would be able to qualify. The tables therefore show cost estimates at three take-up rates: 50%, 65%, and 75%. There is, of course, no way of knowing by how much the take-up rate would increase if the entry requirement for benefits were shortened. This is an important caveat, since the cost of the program would vary significantly, depending on what percentage of potentially eligible workers claim benefits.

No attempt has been made to estimate costs if fathers as well as mothers claim benefits. Since men, on average, have higher earnings than women, it might be assumed that high claim rates by men would add to the cost of the program. However, there are two reasons for excluding this factor from the calculation:

i) Experience in other countries indicates that in the early years of a parental benefits program, few fathers actually claim benefits. (Making the benefit available to fathers is, however, an important policy principle, for reasons discussed earlier.) Sweden's program has been in existence for ten years and only 22% of eligible fathers now claim benefits. In the early years of the program, less than 10% claimed.

ii) If a limit of maximum insurable earnings is imposed on the program, then total benefit payments will not be increased as a result of including more claimants who earn above the maximum limit. This will be a consideration only for those options where no limit to benefits is imposed. This should be taken into account in consideration of those options with no maximum limit shown in the table.

In order to develop cost projections of the various policy options, it is necessary to make assumptions about participation rates and fertility rates so as to calculate the number of potential claimants. These assumptions and other details of the methodology are described in the Appendix to this report.

Table 2

Total Cost of Various Options for a National System of Paid Parental Leave

$ Million (1985 dollars)

Year	Benefit Level	15 weeks of benefits (% take-up) 50%	65%	75%	26 weeks of benefits (% take-up) 50%	65%	75%
1985	60% ins.	382	496	573	662	859	993
	95% ins.	605	784	907	1048	1360	1572
	75% total	603	782	904	1045	1355	1567
	95% total	764	991	1146	1325	1718	1987
1990	60% ins.	376	490	564	652	849	978
	95% ins.	595	775	893	1032	1343	1548
	75% total	593	772	890	1029	1339	1543
	95% total	752	979	1128	1304	1697	1956
2000	60% ins.	328	424	490	569	735	849
	95% ins.	520	671	775	901	1163	1343
	75% total	518	669	772	898	1159	1339
	95% total	657	848	979	1138	1469	1697

Note: Program cost for the year 1985 (assuming a 50% take-up rate, with benefits at 60%, payable for 15 weeks) is calculated by multiplying the potential claimants (128 000) by the number of benefit/weeks (15 X $199) to give a total cost of $382 million. (See Appendix for detailed methodology.)

Table 2 shows the total cost of the program under various policy options. In order to determine the cost of a paid parental leave program over and above the existing maternity benefits program, the assumed costs of the existing UI maternity benefits program in 1985 were deducted from the cost of the various options. The results are shown in the following table.

Table 3

Additional Cost of Expanding the Existing Program of UI Maternity Benefits to Provide Paid Parental Leave

$ Million (1985 dollars)

Year	Benefit Level	15 weeks of benefits (% take-up) 50%	65%	75%	26 weeks of benefits (% take-up) 50%	65%	75%
1985	60% ins.	-	114	191	280	477	611
	95% ins.	223	402	525	666	978	1,190
	75% total	221	400	522	663	973	1,185
	95% total	382	609	764	943	1,336	1,605
1990	60% ins.	-	114	188	276	473	602
	95% ins.	219	399	517	656	967	1,172
	75% total	217	396	514	653	963	1,167
	95% total	376	603	752	928	1,321	1,580
2000	60% ins.	-	96	162	241	407	521
	95% ins.	192	343	447	573	835	1,015
	75% total	190	341	444	570	831	1,011
	95% total	329	520	651	810	1,141	1,369

The results of the cost calculations presented in Tables 2 and 3 may be summarized as follows:

- A national system of fully-paid parental leave, replacing 95% of earnings, up to the maximum insurable earnings limit, and paying benefits for 26 weeks, would cost approximately $1360 million in 1985, assuming that 65% of potentially eligible claimants actually received benefits. If the take-up rate were higher, the program would cost about $1572 million. At a 65% take-up rate, the program would cost about $978 million more than the existing program is likely to cost in 1985.

- Total program costs would be reduced to $1343 million (in 1985 dollars) in 2000 as a result of the levelling off of participation rates.

- If no maximum earnings limit is placed on the 95% income replacement ratio, the total cost of the program would be about $1718 million, or $1336 million more than the existing program will cost.

- If the qualifying period of 20 weeks is retained, and the take-up rate remains at the current level of about 50%, but the benefit level is increased to 95%, with retention of the payment period at 15 weeks, the additional cost of the program in 1985 would be $223 million more than the existing program would cost.

It is clear from the above estimates that significant differences in cost result from changing various assumptions, particularly those about take-up rates. In view of the impossibility of arriving at an accurate forecast of take-up rates, all the above cost estimates should be approached with caution.

The intention of the estimates is to present a range of possible options for the guidance of policy-makers, as well as to serve as the basis for the discussion of funding in the following section of this report. For the purposes of that discussion, we will focus on one particular policy option: a paid leave at 95% of earnings, with a maximum insurable earnings limit, with benefits payable for 26 weeks, and assuming a 65% take-up rate. This option was chosen because it meets parental leave criteria (discussed earlier) of a higher level of benefits for a longer period of time. The retention of a maximum insurable earnings limit seems reasonable in view of the fact that other government programs have similar limits. The assumption of a 65% take-up rate reflects the possibility that entry requirements may be eased somewhat, but are perhaps unlikely to be such that the take-up rate will increase from the current 50% to 75%.

5.1 Funding an Expanded Program for Paid Parental Leave

The existing program of UI maternity benefits is financed entirely from contributions made by employers and employees, with employees paying $2.35 for each $100 of weekly insurable earnings (1985 contribution rates). The employer pays 1.4 times the employee contribution (or $3.29 per $100 of weekly insurable earnings in 1985). It has been estimated that an increase in employee premiums of 5 cents per $100 of insurable earnings, along with the resultant 7 cent increase in employer premiums (1.4 times the employee rate) generates about $180 million in revenue for the UI fund.[53] Just what kind of premium increase would be required to finance the preferred policy option outlined in the previous section would depend on whether the federal government contributed to the program. In many other countries, as we have seen, governments contribute anywhere from 25% to 80% of the cost of maternity benefits.

The entire UI program in 1983, including regular unemployment benefits and social benefits such as sickness and maternity, cost close to $11.3 billion. The cost to the federal government was $2.8 billion.[54] In other words, more than 75% of the cost of benefits was paid by the private sector. In relation to the financing of the entire program, the Task Force said that an increase in the government's share of the program from its present level would raise the proportion of program funds gathered through the progressive vehicle of taxes and increase the program's redistributive effects. A greater tax-based program share would also reduce any disincentive to hire workers which may be implicit in payroll taxes in general and UI premiums in particular. (Payroll taxes raise the cost of employing workers and also may inhibit employment growth in favour of more use of machinery and equipment, according to the Task Force.)[55]

Some of the same arguments may be used in relation to the disincentive employers may have to hire women of childbearing age if payroll taxes for maternity benefits are set at high levels. However, it is evident that such disincentives would be lessened if benefits were payable to fathers as well as mothers. If paid parental leave is to be based on the assumption that childbirth is a social cost which should be borne by all members of society, and that such leave is an integral part of government policies to promote full equality between men and women in Canadian society, than an argument can be made that all taxpayers, should share in the cost through the federal government.

The Task Force recommended that the federal government should pay a fixed share of 15% of the cost of all programs provided through UI, including maternity benefits.

Assuming no change in the current funding arrangements, that is, that the entire cost of the program would continue to be funded by contributions from employers and employees, the recommended option (26 weeks of benefits at 95%, with a maximum insurable earnings limit, and assuming a 65% take-up rate) would mean an increase in employee premiums of 27 cents per $100 of insurable earnings, and an increase in employer contributions of 1.4 times that amount, or 38 cents per $100 of insurable earnings. Those amounts represent an increase in existing 1985 premium rates of 11.5% for employees and 11.6% for employers. The total increase of 65 cents would generate about $978 million for the UI fund, which is the additional cost of the recommended option over and above the existing program.

For employees earning at or above the maximum insurable earnings limit, these increases would be $1.75 a week each for the employer's share and $1.24 a week each for the employee's share.

If the federal government were to pay 15% of the cost, as suggested by the Task Force, it would incur costs of $204 million in 1985. (Because the government contributes nothing to the cost of existing benefits, the additional cost to the government must be calculated by taking 15% of the total cost of this option, i.e., 15% of $1360 million.) This funding option would entail an increase in employee premiums of 23 cents per $100 of insurable earnings, or $1.06 a week for someone earning at, or above, the maximum. For those with lower earnings, the increase, of course, would be less. The employer would have to pay an additional 32 cents for each $100 of weekly insurable earnings, or $1.47 a week for a worker earning at, or above, the maximum. These amounts represent a 9.7% increase in employer premiums and a 9.9% increase in those of employees.

If the federal government were to contribute a greater share of the cost of benefits, then the required premium increases would obviously be lower. If, for instance, the government contributed 25% of the benefit cost, as governments in some other countries do, it would incur costs of $340 million in 1985 (25% of $1360 million). Employee premiums would then have to rise by 21 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings, or about 97 cents a week for someone earning at or above the maximum insurable earnings. The employer premium would rise by 29 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings, or $1.33 a week for an employee earning at or above the maximum insurable earnings. These increases represent an 8.8% increase for employers and an 8.9% increase for employees above existing 1985 premium rates.

To summarize, then, the cost of the recommended paid parental leave option would involve premium increases for employers of between 8% and 12%, or at the very most, between $1.33 and $1.75 a week for an employee earning at or above the maximum insurable earnings limit.

The additional cost for employees would be between 97 cents and $1.24 a week for someone earning at, or above, the maximum, and less for lower-income workers. This is an increase of between 8% and 12%.

The increased cost to the government of implementing the paid parental leave option chosen would range from nothing (if existing funding arrangements are retained) to $340 million (if it contributes 25% of the benefit cost).

All these calculations, of course, assume that the ratio between employer and employee contributions remains the same as it is now -- that is, the employer pays 1.4 times the contribution of the employee.

It seems clear from the foregoing discussion that the costs of financing an expansion of the existing maternity benefits program to provide a national system of paid parental leave would not be excessive.

5.2 The Cost of Other Parental Leave Options

The other possible components of a paid parental leave program (discussed earlier in this report), such as paid days off to care for a sick child, shorter working hours for parents, and perhaps longer annual leave for those with family responsibilities, have not been included in the cost calculations in the preceding section. Costs of this type of program are more difficult to estimate since there is no program experience on which to base the estimate. To arrive at an estimate with some validity, we would need to know the number of families with young children, the likely incidence of childhood illness, the possible take-up rate and so on.

However, we may arrive at a rough cost estimate as follows:[56]

a) The number of families likely to have newborn children in 1985 is 256 000.

b) If we assume 75% of these families might make a claim for days off to care for sick children, the number of claims for paid days off would be 192 000.

c) The weekly benefit rate for a benefit level of 95% of insurable earnings would be $315.

d) If we assume that each claimant would take five days off during the year (i.e., one week of benefits), the cost would be $60 480 000 (192 000 X $315).

e) If this additional cost were funded only by employer/employee contributions, it would require a further increase of 2 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings for the employee (9 cents a week for someone earning at or above maximum insurable earnings), and 3 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings for the employer (or 14 cents a week for an employee earning at or above the maximum).

f) If the government were to contribute 15% of the cost of this benefit, government outlays of $9 million would be required. Employee premiums would than have to rise by 1 1/2 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings, (or 7 cents a week for someone earning at or above maximum insurable earnings limit), and 2 cents per $100 of weekly insurable earnings for the employer (or 9 cents a week for an employee earning at or above the maximum insurable earnings).

These estimates (as all the other estimates in this section) are based on the assumption of a 5 cent increase in employee premiums per $100 of weekly insurable earnings, accompanied by a 7 cent increase in employer premiums per $100 of weekly insurable earnings would generate $180 million in increased revenue for the UI fund.

While the reliability of these estimates is certainly open to question in view of the likelihood of inaccuracy in the assumptions on which they are based, they nevertheless may serve as an indication that the additional cost of including paid days off to care for sick children in the parental leave package is likely to be minimal.

5.3 The Cost of Replacing Absent Employees

In all of the possible options explored above, no attempt has been made to estimate the cost to an employer of replacing a worker who is absent on parental leave. Whether an employer would have to hire a temporary replacement for the absent worker would depend on the nature of the work, the workload of the other employees in the group, and the duration of the absence. The suggestion made in some European countries (and referred to in Section II of this report) that absent workers be replaced by hiring unemployed young persons as a way of dealing with high youth unemployment, would clearly not be appropriate in many cases.

Interestingly enough, while the cost of replacing absent workers is often raised by those who oppose paid parental leave (and as an argument against paid maternity leave too) such arguments do not seem to be used against paid holidays, paid sick leave, or other types of leave.

Despite the rather extensive literature on paid parental leaves in other countries, the cost of replacing absent workers seldom is raised as a cost issue. It should be emphasized that the "incidence" of maternity among women workers as a group may be much lower than many employers believe. Data indicate[57] that the percentage of female employees who take maternity leave in any year may be about 4%, but that in any group of employees where women are represented in the same proportion as they are in the work force as a whole, those away on maternity leave at any particular time may represent between 1% and 2% of the total workers employed.

Although these estimates are only rough approximations, they imply that replacement costs, if they are incurred at all, may not be high in relation to total payroll.

5.4 Conclusions

All things considered, it appears that the implementation of a national system of fully paid parental leave can best be achieved through an expansion of the maternity benefits program now available under the Unemployment Insurance Act. The cost of such a program would not be high, and there are a number of possible options from which to choose.

Regardless of the option chosen, and whether or not Canada chooses to implement paid parental leave through the existing program or through some other means, the importance of policy development in this field cannot be over-emphasized. Canada lags behind many of the major industrialized countries, and even some of the less-industrialized ones, in the provision of paid leave for parents. In light of its commitment to the full and equal integration of women into the national economy, the need for a fully paid leave program is urgent.

The implementation of such a program in the current economic climate will not be easy. But the longer such a program is delayed, the higher will be the costs to Canadian society. Because these costs are difficult to quantify, they are seldom taken into account in discussion of this issue. Nevertheless, they are costs which are imposed on families and on children by allowing the existing situation to continue. It may well be that these are costs Canada can no longer afford.

NOTES

1 Statistics Canada, Labour Force Annual Averages, 1975-1983, Catalogue 71-529, Table 3.

2 Ibid, calculated from Table 29.

3 Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey Directorate, unpublished data.

4 Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, "Company Maternity Leave Policies, The Big Picture," in Working Woman, February 1984.

5 Sheila B. Kamerman, Alfred J. Kahn and Paul Kingston, Maternity Policies and Working Women, New York, Columbia University Press, 1983.

6 Working Party on the Role of Women in the Economy, The Integration of Women in the Economy, OECD, Paris, 1984.

7 Ibid.

8 Monica Townson, A National System of Fully-Paid Parental Leave For Canada: Policy Choices, Costs and Funding Mechanisms, Women's Bureau, Labour Canada, Ottawa, 1983.

9 Information presented in this section is based largely on a series of personal interviews with heads of delegations attending the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe seminar on "The Economic Role of Women in the ECE Region" held in Vienna, in October 1984. Specific sources will be named as and where relevant.

10 The Equality of Women in the USSR, The Implementation in the USSR of the provisions of the Convention of the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women, Moscow, 1983.

11 The Employment of Women in the German Democratic Republic, transmitted by the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the ECE Seminar on the Economic Role of Women in the ECE Region, Vienna, October 1984. ECE/SEM.6/R.3/ADD.3 (RESTRICTED).

12 Sources of information: Interview with Mrs. Vesselina Peytcheva, Secretary to the Committee of the Movement of Bulgarian Women; 100 Questions and Answers Concerning Bulgarian Women, Bulgarian Women's Committee, Sofia, 1983; La Condition Juridique de la Femme en R.P. de Bulgarie, Milanka Vidova, Sofia Presse, 1981.

13 Sources of information: Interview with Ms. Dagmar Molkova, Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, Government of Czechoslovakia; Jaroslava Bauerova, Specific Problems of Female Labour in Czechoslovakia, transmitted by the Government of Czechoslovakia to the ECE seminar on the Economic Role of Women, Vienna, October 1984, ECE/SEM.6/R.1/Add.4 (RESTRICTED).

14 Sources of information: Interview with Dr. Helga Horz, Head of GDR Delegation to the ECE seminar on the Economic Role of Women in the ECE Region, Vienna, October 1984; The Employment of Women in the German Democratic Republic, transmitted by the government of the GDR to the ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984, ECE/SEM.6/R.3/ADD.3 (RESTRICTED); "Gemeinsamer Beschlusse," Neues Deutschland, 18 May, 1984.

15 Sources of information: Interview with Mrs. Vera Vandor, Member, Foreign Relations Committee, National Council of Hungarian Women; "The Position of the Working Woman in Hungary", statement by the Hungarian delegation to the ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984.

16 Participation rate data are for 1976, referred to in Kamerman and Kahn, Child Care, Family Benefits and Working Parents: A Study in Comparative Policy, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.

17 Source of information: The Equality of Women in the USSR, supra footnote 10.

18 Sources of information: Interview with Zivana Olbina, Member of Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Serbia; Polonca Koncar, Labour Law as a Factor for Promoting the Economic Status of Women, transmitted by the Government of Yugoslavia to the ECE seminar, ECE/SEM.6/R.4/Add.7 (RESTRICTED), Vienna, October 1984; Dimitar Mircev, The Role of Organizations of Associated Labour in the Socio-Economic Advancement of Women in Yugoslavia, ECE/SEM.6/R.4/Add.4 (RESTRICTED), Vienna, October 1984; The Economic Position of Women in Yugoslavia, ECE/SEM.6/R.1/ADD.11 (RESTRICTED), transmitted by the Government of Yugoslavia to the ECE seminar, Vienna, October 1984.

19 Government of Sweden, Department of State, Report to the United Nations on the Status of Women in Sweden, Stockholm, 1968.

20 Ibid.

21 op. cit. supra footnote 16.

22 OECD Historical Statistics 1960-1981, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, 1983.

23 OECD Employment Outlook, Paris, September 1982.

24 Birgitta Wistrand, Swedish Women on the Move, The Swedish Institute, Stockholm, 1981.

25 Sources of information: Statement by delegation of Denmark to ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984; "Denmark: Parental Leave Legislation," European Industrial Relations Review, No. 122, March 1984.

26 European Industrial Relations Review, op. cit.

27 Source of information: International Labour Office, Geneva, Social and Labour Bulletin, No. 2, June 1982; Central Statistical Office of Finland, Position of Women, Statistical Surveys No. 72, Helsinki, 1984; The Economic Role of Women in Finland at the Beginning of the 1980s, transmitted by the Government of Finland to the ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984, ECE/SEM.6/R.1/ADD.6 (RESTRICTED).

28 Sources of information: Interview with Kari Skrede, Institute of Applied Social Research, Oslo; Social Insurance in Norway, The National Insurance Institution, Oslo, September 1981; Worker Protection and Working Environment Act, February 4, 1977, with amendments of June 1981, May 1982 and December 1982, Directorate of Labour Inspection, Oslo, April 1983.

29 Sources of information: Ylva Ericsson, The Economic Role of Women in Sweden, transmitted by the Government of Sweden to the ECE Seminar, Vienna, October, 1984, ECE/SEM.6/R.1/ADD.7 (RESTRICTED); Birgitta Wistrand, Swedish Women on the Move, the Swedish Institute, Stockholm, 1981; Kamerman, Kahn and Kingston, op.cit. supra footnote 5.

30 Sources of information: European Industrial Relations Review, Nos. 117 (October 1983), 119 (December 1983), 120 (January 1984); Commission of the European Communities, Comparative Tables of the Social Security Schemes in the Member States of the European Communities, 12th Edition, July 1982; Kamerman, Kahn and Kingston, op.cit. supra footnote 5.

31 The countries of the EEC are Belgium, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

32 Additional sources of information for this section: "International Maternity and Parental Leave," European Industrial Relations Review, No. 97, February 1982.

33 Additional sources of information for Belgium: "Belgium - New Approaches to Personal Leave," European Industrial Relations Review, No. 117, October, 1983.

34 Additional sources of information: The Economic Role of Women in the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitted by the Government of the FRG to the ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984, ECE/SEM.6/R.1/ADD.9 (RESTRICED).

35 Additional source of information: "United Kingdom Maternity Leave Developments," European Industrial Relations Review, No. 74, March 1980.

36 International Labour Office, Geneva, Social and Labour Bulletin, No. 2, June 1982.

37 Chantal Paoli, "Women Workers and Maternity: Some examples from Western Europe", International Labour Review, Vol. 121, No. 1, January-February 1982.

38 For a more detailed discussion of this question, see Townson (1983) op.cit. supra footnote 8.

39 Kamerman and Kahn (1984) supra footnote 4.

40 Ibid.

41 Sources of information include: Maternity and Child Care Leave in Canada, Women's Bureau, Labour Canada, 1983; "Unemployment Insurance Adoption Benefits", Employment and Immigration Canada Press Release, December 29, 1983.

42 Employment and Immigration Canada, unpublished data.

43 Employment and Immigration Canada, Unemployment Insurance in the 1980s, Report of the Task Force on Unemployment Insurance, July 1981.

44 Townson (1983) op.cit. supra footnote 8.

45 Employment and Immigration Canada, unpublished data.

46 Garry Dingledine, A chronology of response: The evolution of Unemployment Insurance From 1940 to 1980, Employment and Immigration Canada, 1981.

47 The Task Force on Unemployment Insurance recommended increasing the repayment rate to 50%.

48 Department of Finance, "A New Direction for Canada: An Agenda for Economic Renewal," presented by Hon. Michael Wilson, Minister of Finance, November 8, 1984.

49 Ibid. p. 78.

50 Employment and Immigration, op.cit. supra footnote 43.

51 Goldfarb Consultants, An Evaluation of Canadians' Attitudes Towards Unemployment Insurance, Canada Employment Centres, and Immigration, Research Report for Employment and Immigration Canada, November 1980.

52 Work for Tomorrow, Report of the Parlimentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s, House of Commons, 1981.

53 Estimates supplied by Departmental officials in 1984.

54 Employment and Immigration Canada, unpublished data.

55 Employment and Immigration Canada, op.cit. supra footnote 43.

56 For methodology and estimates, see Appendix.

57 Townson (1983) op.cit. supra footnote 8, Section III.

APPENDIX

Methodology for Costing Policy Options for Fully-Paid Parental Leave

Year	Participation Rate*1 (%)	No. of Births*2 ('000)	Potential Claimants*3 ('000)	Number of Claims*4 '000			Weekly Benefit Rates*5 1985 $			
							Insured Earnings		Total Earnings*6	
				50%	65%	75%	60%	95%	75%	95%
1983	68	373	254	127	165	191	169.26*			
1985	70	365	256	128	166	192	199	315	314	398
1990	76	331	252	126	164	189	199	315	314	398
2000	83	264	219	110	142	164	199	315	314	398

* Average weekly maternity benefit paid in 1983.

Notes:

1. Participation rates are for women in the 25-34 year age group. (The average age at which a mother claims maternity benefits under the existing program is about 27 years.) Rates for 1985-2000 are projections from Dan Ciuriak and Harvey Sims, Participation Rate and Labour Force Growth in Canada, Department of Finance, April 1980, Table 15, p. 47. In view of the continuing decline in fertility rates, the higher of two projections made by these authors was chosen.

2. For 1983, the actual number of births is shown. Projections for 1985-2000 are from Statistics Canada, Population Projections for Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1984-2006, Catalogue No. 91-520, (forthcoming). These projections assume that the fertility rate will continue to decline from the current level of 1.66 to reach 1.4 by 1996, stablizing at that level thereafter. Net international migration is assumed to be 50 000 a year, slightly higher than the current level of about 46 000 annually.

3. The number of potential claimants is calculated by multiplying the number of births by the participation rate.

4. The number of claimants is calculated by multiplying the number of potential claimants by the percentages representing various take-up rates (e.g., 128 000 claims in 1985 represents 50% of the potential claimants from column 3).

5. Four different benefit rates are shown in the table. Amounts in the first column indicate average weekly maternity benefits likely to be paid in 1985 under the existing program, with benefits set at 60% of earnings up to the maximum insurable earnings limit. Over the last three years, average weekly maternity benefits paid have declined in relation to the maximum weekly unemployment benefit, from 75% in 1981 to 73% in 1983. It has been assumed that in 1985, the average weekly maternity benefit will be 72% of the maximum weekly unemployment benefit. The amount of $199 thus represents 72% of the maximum weekly unemployment benefit of $276 announced by the Minister of Finance in his economic statement of November 8, 1984.

The second column of benefit rates shows the average weekly benefit payable if benefits were set at 95% of insured earnings instead of 60% (and making the same general assumptions about the relationship of maternity benefits to unemployment benefits as outlined in the previous paragraph, i.e., $315 = $\frac{\$199}{60}$ X 95).

The third and fourth columns show benefit rates at 75% and 95% of total earnings -- that is without any maximum insurable earnings limit. Calculations were made as follows:

i) Average earnings of women between the ages of 25 and 34 who were employed full time in 1982 were $16 810 (or $323 a week). (Source: Statistics Canada, Income Distributions by Size in Canada, 1982, Catalogue No. 13-207, Table 73.)

ii) Maximum insurable earnings under the Unemployment Insurance scheme in 1982 were $350 a week.

iii) Average weekly earnings of women in the main childbearing years who worked full time were thus 91% of the UI maximum insurable earnings.

iv) Assuming this relationship will prevail in 1985, average weekly earnings of those women most likely to claim benefits would be 91% of $460, or $419. This figure is then used to calculate the average weekly maternity benefit where benefit levels are set at 75% and 95% of earnings without a maximum limit.

6. It should be noted that these calculations are based on female salaries only. To the extent that fathers claim benefits, average weekly parental benefits may be higher because men's salaries are considerably higher than those of women. Average earnings of men aged 25-34 employed full time in 1982, for example, were $23 579, or 40% higher than the average earnings of full-time women workers in the same age group. Average weekly benefits for 1985 based on male salaries would be as follows:

60% of insurable earnings = $276
95% of insurable earnings = $437
75% of total earnings = $445
95% of total earnings = $563

Since it is not known what percentage of fathers will claim benefits or how the number of weeks of parental leave might be shared between both parents, no attempt has been made to estimate the cost of relating benefits to higher male salaries.

Swedish experience indicates that in the early years of a paid parental leave program, few eligible fathers take advantage of the program. When the Swedish program was initiated in 1974, only 2% of eligible fathers claimed benefits. By the fifth year of the program, less than 15% of fathers claimed, and most of those were married to high-earning women. In others words, the amount of benefit paid in such cases would probably be less if the father claimed than if the mother did. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that, at least in the early years of a fully paid parental leave program, the fact that fathers or mothers may claim benefits would be unlikely to have a significant impact on benefit costs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauerova, Jaroslova, Specific Problems of Female Labour in Czechoslovakia, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Bulgarian Women's Committee, 100 Questions and Answers Concerning Bulgarian Women, Sofia, 1983.

Canada, Employment and Immigration, Unemployment Insurance in the 1980s, Report of the Task Force on Unemployment Insurance, July 1981.

Canada, Finance Department, A New Direction for Canada: An Agenda for Economic Renewal, Presented by Hon. Michael Wilson, Minister of Finance, November 8, 1984.

Canada, House of Commons, Work for Tomorrow, Report of the Parlimentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s, 1981.

Canada, Labour Canada Women's Bureau, Maternity and Child Care Leave in Canada, 1983.

Canada, Statistics Canada, Labour Force Annual Averages, 1975-1983, Catalogue No. 71-529.

Dingledine, Garry, A chronology of response: The evolution of Unemployment Insurance From 1940 to 1980, Employment and Immigration Canada, 1981.

European Economic Community, Comparative Tables of the Social Security Schemes in the Member States of the European Communities, 12th Edition, July 1982.

European Industrial Relations Review, No. 74, March 1980; No. 97, February 1982; No. 117, October 1983; No. 122, March 1984.

Ericsson, Ylva, The Economic Role of Women in Sweden, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Federal Republic of Germany, The Economic Role of Women in the Federal Republic of Germany, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Finland, Central Statistical Office, Position of Women, Statistical Surveys No. 72, Helsinki, 1984.

Finland, Government of, The Economic Role of Women in Finland at the Beginning of the 1980s, ECE Seminar, October 1984 (restricted).

German Democratic Republic, Government of, The Employment of Women in the German Democratic Republic, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Goldfarb Consultants, An Evaluation of Canadians' Attitudes Towards Unemployment Insurance, Canada Employment Centres, and Immigration, Research Report for Employment and Immigration Canada, November 1980.

International Labour Office, Social and Labour Bulletin, No. 2, Geneva, June 1982.

Kamerman, Sheila B., Alfred J. Kahn, Child Care, Family Benefits, and Working Parents: A Study in Comparative Policy, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.

Kamerman, Sheila B., Alfred J. Kahn and Paul Kingston, Maternity Policies and Working Women, New York, Columbia University Press, 1983.

Kamerman, Sheila B. and Alfred J. Kahn, "Company Maternity Leave Policies, the Big Picture" in Working Woman, February 1984.

Koncar, Polonca, Labour Law as a Factor for Promoting the Economic Status of Women (Yugoslavia), ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Mircev, Dimitar, The Role of Organizations of Associated Labour in the Socio-Economic Advancement of Women in Yugoslavia, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

Norway, National Insurance Institution, Social Insurance in Norway, Oslo, September 1981.

Norway, Directorate of Labour Inspection, Worker Protection and Working Environment Act, Oslo, April 1983.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Employment Outlook, Paris, September 1983.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Historical Statistics 1960-1981, Paris, 1983.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, The Integration of Women in the Economy, Report of the Working Party on the Role of Women in the Economy, Paris, 1984.

Paoli, Chantal, "Women workers and maternity: Some examples from Western Europe" in International Labour Review, Vol. 121, No. 1, January-February 1982.

Townson, Monica, A National System of Fully-Paid Parental Leave for Canada: Policy Choices, Costs and Funding Mechanisms, Women's Bureau, Labour Canada, 1983.

USSR, Government of, The Equality of Women in the USSR, The implementation in the USSR of the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Moscow, 1983.

Vidova, Milanka, La Condition Juridique de la Femme en R.P. de Bulgarie, Sofia Presse, 1981.

Wistrand, Birgitta, Swedish Women on the Move, The Swedish Institute, Stockholm, 1981.

Yugoslavia, Government of, The Economic Position of Women in Yugoslavia, ECE Seminar, Vienna, October 1984 (restricted).

A STUDY OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE IN CANADA

A paper prepared by

Rothman Beach Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		61
1.0	INTRODUCTION	62
2.0	EXISTING PROGRAMS	65
3.0	POLICIES AND PROGRAMS OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE UNIONS	79
4.0	ISSUES	88
5.0	CONCLUSION	101
NOTES		103

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Work-Related Day Care Inventory	104
Appendix B	Provincial Funding Programs	110
Appendix C	Day Care Centres in Post-Secondary Institutions	112
Appendix D	Additional Resources	114
Appendix E	Interview Schedules	115
Appendix F	Bibliography on Work-Related Day Care	131

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
2.2.1	Distribution of Work-Related Day Care Programs by Province	66
2.2.2	Location of Programs	67
2.3.1	Sponsorship	68
2.3.2	Centre Ownership and Management	69
2.3.3	Years in Operation	69
2.4.1	Licensed Capacity of Work-Related Day Care Centres	70
2.4.2	Number and Proportion of Work-Related Day Care Spaces	71
2.4.3	Centre Utilization (Percentage of Capacity)	72
2.4.4	Enrollment and Utilization	73
2.4.5	Employee Utilization Rates	73
2.5.1	Centres by Youngest Age Served	74
2.5.2	Number of Infants (Under 18 Months) Served in Work-Related Day Care Centres	75
2.6.1	Range of Fees by Province	76
2.7.1	On-going Support	77

PREFACE

This study of work-related day care in Canada was conducted by Rothman Beach Associates under contract with the Federal Task Force on Child Care, and under the direction of Karen Stotsky, Senior Policy Advisor to the Task Force.

The study was coordinated by Jane Beach and Laurel Rothman, who were the authors of the report. Marian Bloom, Joanne Corbeil, Bibianne d'Ostie, Therese LeBlanc, Danielle Leroux and Susan Prentice administered the interviews with the day care supervisors. Barry McPeake provided editorial services and Susan Prentice typed the draft and final versions of the report.

The supervisors of the day care centres surveyed, and the provincial officials responsible for day care made a considerable commitment of time and effort through the interviews. Their assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

The authors would like to particularly thank Ruth Rose-Lizée for her invaluable assistance with the data collection in Quebec. Both the execution of the study and the report of its findings were the result of the cooperation of a significant number of people.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The steady increase in the labour force participation rate of mothers in Canada since the mid-1970s has created a growing demand for child care services. Despite the various ups and downs of the business cycle, mothers appear to continue to enter and remain in the paid labour force. One particularly striking trend is that the mothers of children under three years of age are participating in the labour force at increasingly higher rates. Statistics indicate that, in 1980, 42 per cent of all mothers of children under three were in the labour force.[1] At the same time, it is not clear that the provision of affordable regulated services is keeping up with the demand. In view of these circumstances, therefore, the question of "Who is minding the children?" has become a central issue for parents, employers and public policymakers.

The Federal Task Force on Child Care has a mandate to examine and assess child care services and parental leave in Canada. This includes a review of adequacy of the current system and policies and in particular, an assessment of the availability and affordability of child care consistent with needs and preferences. The objective of the Task Force is to make recommendations to the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women regarding the development of a quality child care system, appropriate financing measures, and the role of the Federal Government.

Over the past few years, a growing component of child care services is that of day care programs sponsored by groups within a given workplace and often located at the work site. Work-related day care programs are initiated by sponsors in response to the child care problems faced by employees which may result in employee turnover, absenteeism, or declining morale. For the user, the programs make day care available at a readily accessible location and, in certain cases, at affordable costs.

In 1964, Riverdale Hospital became the first employer in Canada to establish a day care program to serve its employees. A chronic care hospital, Riverdale sought to attract trained nurses at a time when there was an acute shortage. By 1976, ten work-related programs had been initiated. Currently, employers in seven out of ten provinces and the Northwest Territories sponsor 79 group day care centres, and have the capacity to accommodate 3477 children or 2.5 per cent of the licensed group day care spaces in Canada. In addition, employers sponsor other programs, including a day care counselling service and a child care allowance program, which help families to meet their child care needs.

While several user and sponsor surveys have been undertaken and literature reviews compiled, there has been no major or comprehensive review of work-related day care in Canada, particularly from a policy development perspective. Thus the Task Force on Child Care asked Rothman/Beach Associates to undertake an analysis of the current situation in Canada.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this study of work-related day care in Canada for the Federal Task Force on Child Care is to:

- provide an inventory and description of current work-related day care programs and activities in Canada;
- review policies and programs of all levels of government with respect to work-related day care;
- provide an analysis of the key issues, including:
  - advantages and disadvantages to users and sponsors;
  - factors affecting the development of work-related programs.
- identify the significant implications for future policy and program development, including the potential role of work-related day care within the range of child care services.

It is quite important to underline that this study does not attempt to evaluate the quality of care in the programs studied. The scope and time-frame of the study did not permit such a complex undertaking. It provides, instead, a description of the range of services which are currently available and utilizes the views of the day care directors for the purposes of identifying and discussing the issues regarding work-related day care.

1.3 Definition

For the purpose of this study, "work-related day care" refers to a day care program which has been established by and/or has some on-going involvement with a sponsoring employer or employee group for the purpose of meeting the child care needs of parents in the paid labour force of the sponsor. Currently, most work-related day care programs are group day care centres. There are work-related supervised private home day care programs and day care counselling services, but they are few. Personnel policies which do not actually assist with the delivery or provision of services, but which may reduce the need for day care or provide some form of financial assistance to parents are also considered.

It was difficult to apply this definition to certain programs in Canada today. Historically, universities and colleges, and in Quebec, C.E.G.E.P.s, have been major sponsors of day care programs. There are, however, a variety of reasons for the establishment of these centres other than the provision of child care to employees. A number were set up as lab schools for Early Childhood Education programs or psychology departments, while others have been used for observation, field placements and other practica. In addition, the universities and colleges are a distinct form of community in which day care facilities not only serve the employees (staff and faculty), but students as well.

While some provinces now include these day care centres with other work-related day care programs, this study does not include them for purposes of analysis. This is because many were not solely or even significantly work-related either in conception or in their current operation. In general, it was beyond the scope of this study to determine the reasons for the

establishment of each of these day care centres and their on-going relationship with various departments within these institutions. It is acknowledged that further study of these programs would be useful in order to determine their level of funding and support and their role in the day care delivery system. A list of these centres has therefore been included in Appendix C.

1.4 Approach

The information and analysis provided within this study was based on short interviews with all known existing programs, in-depth interviews with a large sample of these programs, and general interviews with the provincial and territorial officials responsible for day care. A total of 91 programs were identified as being in operation as of September 1, 1984. After completing the interviews, twelve were found to no longer exist, not to be work-related, or not to fit within the stated definition.

Short telephone interviews were conducted with each day care program that was identified as work-related in the literature[2] and by the provincial officials responsible for day care. Since licensing information is often updated only yearly or semi-annually, each of the programs contacted was asked to identify any work-related day care programs about which they may have been aware or with which they had contact, to ensure that a complete list of programs would be compiled. The purpose of the short interview was to acquire basic information about the program including: location, type of sponsor, number of years in operation, size, utilization rate, users, ages served, fees and levels of on-going support. This provided the basis for the description of existing programs in Chapter Two.

Telephone interviews were also conducted with the provincial and territorial officials responsible for day care in order to determine the funding approaches in each province and territory and the way in which services are delivered. These interviews provided the basis for much of the description of current policies and programs in Chapter Three.

Forty-two of the 79 existing programs were selected for further in-depth interviews. The selection was based on geographical distribution, years in operation, type of sponsor and user group, and level of support. The in-depth interviews identified reasons for starting the program, start-up assistance, hours of operation, benefits and drawbacks to users and sponsors from the day care program's perspective, and the difficulties that the centre may have experienced. These interviews as well as the experience of the authors and a review of the literature provided the basis for the structure and much of the substantive discussion of the issues set out in Chapter Four.

Work-related day care programs are part of the broader community-based programs available to the public which form a basis for comparison throughout this study. The fifth and final chapter concludes this study with a discussion of work-related day care in the overall system of community-based day care.

The Appendices include a detailed inventory of current programs, a chart of provincial approaches to funding, a list of university- and community-college-related day care programs, a list of additional persons contacted in the course of the study and, finally, a detailed bibliography of works pertaining to work-related day care.

2.0 EXISTING PROGRAMS

2.1 Introduction

This section of the report provides a description and inventory of existing work-related day care programs across the country. While it focuses primarily on centre-based activities and programs, other employer-sponsored initiatives are also included. It is based upon an exhaustive search of programs across the country and subsequent interviews with personnel from each of them. In this regard, interviews were held with 78 of 79 centres and supplemented with information in public records.

This section deals with the key descriptive characteristics of the programs and provides comparative information where appropriate. The major characteristics considered immediately below include:

- Number and location
- Sponsor type and years in operation
- Size and utilization
- Ages served and fees
- On-going support

These characteristics are defined primarily by province and in some cases by sponsor type. Appendix A provides a detailed inventory that outlines basic data for each program.

2.2 The Number and Location of Programs

As of September 1, 1984, there were a total of 79 work-related day care centres in seven provinces and the Northwest Territories. There were no work-related programs in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland or the Yukon. The table below indicates the number and location of programs currently in operation.

Table 2.2.1

Distribution of Work-Related Day Care Programs by Province

Province	Number	Percentage*
British Columbia	3	4
Alberta	3	4
Saskatchewan	1	1
Manitoba	5	6
Ontario	16	20
Quebec	49	62
New Brunswick	0	0
Nova Scotia	1	1
Prince Edward Island	0	0
Newfoundland	0	0
Yukon	0	0
Northwest Territories	1	1
Total	79	99

* does not total 100 as a result of rounding

As the table indicates, the overwhelming majority of programs are located in Ontario and Quebec, which together have 65, or 82 per cent of the total.

Clearly, the proportion of programs in Quebec considerably exceeds its share of the population in Confederation (about 26 per cent), or its share of licensed group day care spaces in Canada (19 per cent). This appears to be the result of both proactive policies and initiatives and the way in which work-related day care is defined in Quebec. Both of these factors are discussed below.

The table summarizes the urban, rural or remote location of work-related day care centres across Canada. As the table indicates, the great majority of the programs (65 of 79, or 82 per cent) are in urban locations, defined as those having a population greater than 10 000. Seventeen of these programs are located in Montreal and Metropolitan Toronto.

Table 2.2.2

Location of Programs

Province	Urban	Rural	Remote	Total
British Columbia	3	0	0	3
Alberta	3	0	0	3
Saskatchewan	1	0	0	1
Manitoba	2	2	1	5
Ontario	14	2	0	16
Quebec	41	8	0	49
Nova Scotia	1	0	0	1
Northwest Territories	0	0	1	1
Total	65	12	2	79

There are, however, 14 programs in a number of small rural and remote communities. In Ontario, there are two programs in rural locations; one on an army base and one in a residential treatment centre. In rural Manitoba communities, there is one program on an army base, one in a health clinic and one located in Churchill, which is accessible only by air. In Quebec, the eight rural programs are located either in hospitals, or local community service centres (Centres Locals de Services Communautaires, or CLSCs) in small rural communities. The centre in the Northwest Territories is located in Nanasivik, a remote community in the Arctic, which serves the entire community. In some cases these programs are the only day care centres in the area and are providing an important community service. It is of particular note that across the country these rural programs are well utilized. Three-quarters of the programs are either fully or over ninety per cent enrolled and have waiting lists.

2.3 Sponsoring Organization and Years in Operation

Day care centres are supported by a wide range of organizations, primarily in the public and parapublic sectors. In a number of cases, it was difficult to determine sponsor type because of overlapping areas of jurisdiction in different provinces and because a number of programs fell into more than one category. For purposes of discussion, sponsorship has been determined by the institution which supports or manages it, that is, day care in a hospital directly operated by a provincial government is categorized as a hospital rather than government. A number of day care programs were initiated by unions but not funded by them. The two day care programs which are defined as union-sponsored are those which were known to have received the bulk of their start-up funding from the union itself.

The category "Other Health Care" includes all non-hospital-based organizations which provide non-residential health-related services. Government-sponsored day care programs include those operating in various ministries, departments and army bases. The other public and parapublic sectors include boards of education, treatment centres, senior citizens' homes and a variety of group homes. Table 2.3.1 below summaries the sponsorship of work-related day care programs by province.

Table 2.3.1

Sponsorship

Province	Sponsoring Organization: Hospital	Other Health Care	Gov't	Other Public	Private Sector	Union	Total
British Columbia	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Alberta	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Saskatchewan	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Manitoba	1	2	1	0	1	0	5
Ontario	6	0	4	5	1	0	16
Quebec	22	9	4	9	5	0	49
Nova Scotia	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
N.W.T.	9	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	33	11	9	14	9	2	79

As Table 2.3.1 indicates, a substantial proportion (44 programs, or about 56 percent) are in hospitals or in other health care institutions. The great majority of these are in Quebec, which has a policy encouraging the operation of day care centres in public institutions. Finally, it is interesting to note that 68 of 79 programs, or 86 percent, are sponsored by public or parapublic institutions, while nine are sponsored by private corporations and two by unions. Again, a majority (five) of private-sector-sponsored programs are in Quebec. While it was beyond the scope of this study, a future study might consider the impact of proactive daycare policy in the public sector on the private sector.

The majority of centres are organized as separate non-profit corporations which operate at arm's length from the sponsoring organizations. The staff in these centres are employees of the daycare corporation rather than of the sponsoring organization. A number of centres, however, operate as departments of the sponsoring organization and day care staff are employed directly by them. Four other programs are contracted to enterprises outside of the sponsoring organization, two of which are non-profit and two of which are commercial operations. The table below summarizes, by province, the ownership of the work-related daycare programs.

Table 2.3.2

Centre Ownership and Management

Province	Separate Non-Profit	Sponsoring Organization	External Agency	Commercial Operator	Total
British Columbia	0	1	2	0	3
Alberta	2	0	0	1	3
Saskatchewan	1	0	0	0	1
Manitoba	3	2	0	0	5
Ontario	13	2	0	1	16
Quebec	49	0	0	0	49
Nova Scotia	0	1	0	0	1
Northwest Territories	0	1	0	0	1
Total	68	7	2	2	79

As Table 2.3.2 above clearly indicates, 68 of the programs (86 per cent) are operated as distinct but related non-profit entities, separate from the sponsoring organization. It would appear that this reflects the desire on the part of many of the sponsoring organizations to shift the responsibilities for the operation and funding, and in a number of cases, to permit the increased involvement and participation of parents. Seven of the programs are operated as departments of the sponsoring organization, reflecting their desire for control and/or tax relief.

As the table below indicates, the overwhelming majority of the programs (69 of 79, or 87 per cent) have been started since 1976, with a significant number (33 programs, or 42 per cent) beginning operation after 1980.

Table 2.3.3

Years in Operation

Province	Pre 1971	1971-75	1976-80	1981-84	Total
British Columbia	1	0	0	2	3
Alberta	1	0	1	1	3
Saskatchewan	0	0	0	1	1
Manitoba	0	3	1	1	5
Ontario	1	0	3	12	16
Quebec	0	4	29	16	49
Nova Scotia	0	0	1	0	1
Northwest Territories	0	0	1	0	1
Total	3	7	36	33	79

The considerable increase in the number of programs in the 1976-80 period took place in Quebec. This may have reflected, as elsewhere, the impact of the feminist movement as well as the unique situation in Quebec; in particular, the political forcefulness of the Common Front negotiations and the receptivity of the Parti Québecois government in that period. The period since 1980 has seen most of the growth take place in Quebec and Ontario. This may reflect the introduction in both provinces of more proactive policies and/or initiatives by the respective governments.

2.4 Capacity and Utilization

With the exception of programs in the Northwest Territories, all day care centres are licensed by their respective provincial governments. These licences limit the number of children a particular centre may admit. This limit, or licensed capacity, is determined by a number of factors, which may include the amount of available indoor and outdoor space, the ages of children to be served and, in some cases, provincial limits on size. In certain instances, a day care may wish to limit enrollment to fewer children than is legally permissible, usually for programmatic reasons. The centre budget and staffing would then be based on the reduced figure. For these day care centres, the operating capacity, rather than the licensed capacity, has been used to indicate size.

Centres range in size from those with a licensed capacity of 15 spaces to those with more than 80 spaces. The majority of centres (51 of 79, or 65 per cent), provide care for between 31 and 60 children. Twenty-nine programs have a capacity of 45 or more, which would indicate a significant allocation of space from the sponsoring body.

The table below indicates, by province, the size of work-related day care centres.

Table 2.4.1

Licensed Capacity of Work-Related Day Care Centres

Province	Over 60 Spaces	46-60 Spaces	31-45 Spaces	less than 30 Spaces	Total Centres
British Columbia	0	0	1	2	3
Alberta	0	1	2	0	3
Saskatchewan	0	0	1	0	1
Manitoba	1	0	1	3	5
Ontario	1	3	9	3	16
Quebec	7	15	17	10	49
Nova Scotia	0	0	0	1	1
Northwest Territories	0	1	0	0	1
Total	9	20	31	19	79

While work-related day care spaces have increased significantly in recent years, they still represent only a fraction of total spaces in Canada. Table 2.4.2 indicates the number of work-related group day care spaces in relation to the total number of licensed group day care spaces in each province. The number of work-related day care spaces was based on each centre's licensed capacity, or the maximum operating capacity as reported by the supervisor. Information on the total number of group day care spaces in each province was provided by the officials responsible for day care. The comparative figures are at best an approximation, since each province has different methods of data collection and definitions of care (for example, the age of a toddler).

Wherever possible, figures do not include half-day nursery programs and specialized or developmental care, which is normally provided for reasons other than to ensure care to children of working parents.

Officials were asked for total spaces as of June 1, 1984. In cases where it was not possible to provide such data, the most recent available figures were used. In the case of the Northwest Territories, figures were estimated, as day care is not yet licensed and no formal statistics are kept.

Table 2.4.2

Number and Proportion of Work-Related Day Care Spaces

Province	Total Group Day Care Spaces*	Total Work-Related Day Care Spaces	Percent
British Columbia	11 424	86	0.75
Alberta	26 442	144	0.54
Saskatchewan	3 493	40	1.15
Manitoba	7 655	193	2.52
Ontario	50 014	644	1.29
Quebec	26 393	2 295	8.70
New Brunswick	2 885	0	0
Nova Scotia	7 873	15	0.19
Prince Edward Island	530	0	0
Newfoundland	769	0	0
Yukon	396	0	0
Northwest Territories	350 **	60	17.4
Total	138 228	3 477	2.52

* Source - Provincial officials responsible for day care.
** Estimated

As Table 2.4.2 above indicates, only about 2.5 per cent of spaces are designated as work-related. Only Quebec, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories are above the national average in regard to the proportion of work-related spaces.

As with community-based day care, actual enrollment is not always up to the capacity of the centre. The supervisors of the work-related day care centres were asked to indicate current enrollment in their program in order to determine how well they were being utilized.

Since enrollment figures fluctuate constantly, centres were asked to estimate their average enrollment in the previous six-month period. The utilization rates is simply the percentage of enrollment to capacity.

Table 2.4.3

Centre Utilization (Percentage of Capacity)

Province	95	80-94	65-99	50-64	50	Total
British Columbia	1	1	0	0	1	3
Alberta	3	0	0	0	0	3
Saskatchewan	0	0	0	1	0	1
Manitoba	3	0	1	1	0	5
Ontario	6	8	2	0	0	16
Quebec	25	17	5	1	0	48 *
Nova Scotia	1	0	0	0	0	1
N.W.T.	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	40	26	8	3	1	78

* Data not available for Garderie sur Une Patte

As Table 2.4.3 above indicates, workplace day care centres for the most part are well utilized regardless of user or sponsor type. Specifically, 66 programs of the total number were operating at 80 per cent or more of capacity, and over half of the programs were virtually full. Centre size, location, sponsoring organization, and management appear to have no bearing on utilization.

Table 2.4.4 shows the actual enrollment in the day care centres by province as well as the total capacity.

Table 2.4.4

Enrollment and Utilization

Province	Number of Work-Related Day Care Spaces	Actual Enrollment	Utilization Rate (Percent)
British Columbia	86	70	81.4
Alberta	144	144	100.0
Saskatchewan	40	25	62.5
Manitoba	193	168	87.0
Ontario	644	581	90.2
Quebec	2 295	2 063	89.9
Nova Scotia	15	15	100.0
Northwest Territories	60	60	100.0
Total	3 447	3 126	89.9

Table 2.4.5 below indicates the percentage of utilization by employee users. For example 70 per cent of the total enrollment in work-related day care centres in Manitoba is comprised of children of employees in sponsoring organizations. It is clear from these figures that, in addition to serving employees, work-related day care in all provinces is providing a service to many other families in the surrounding community.

This is particularly the case in Quebec, where over one-half of the spaces in work-related day care centres is occupied by children other than those of employees of the sponsoring organization. This follows, however, from a deliberate policy in public sector institutions which encourages the provision of child care not only for employees but for the community as well. In other instances, the utilization of work-related day care spaces by the broader community appears to reflect the need for a bigger population base and the flexibility required as a result of the ever-changing age structure of the children of employees.

Table 2.4.5

Employee Utilization Rate

Province	Actual Enrollment	Number of Employees Enrolled	Utilization by Employees (%)
British Columbia	70	41	58.6
Alberta	144	113	70.2
Saskatchewan	25	16	64.0
Manitoba	168	118	70.2
Ontario	581	437	75.2
Quebec	2 063	968	46.9
Nova Scotia	15	5	33.3
Northwest Territories	60	54	90.0
Total	3 126	1 752	56.0

2.5 Age Groups Served

Most centres serve two or more of the predominant non-school-age groups in day care, namely, infants (generally 9-18 months), toddlers (generally 18-30 months) and preschoolers (varying in definition by province, but usually starting between two and three years of age and including children up to the age of five). While those programs which serve the younger age groups tend to also serve the older groups, the converse proportion is much less true. Thus, while 78 of 79 centres serve preschoolers, only 45 centres serve infants.

The statistics regarding the ages of children served in the programs are presented below. The table shows the number of centres by youngest age group served. For example, ten centres in Ontario care for infants under 18 months of age, while in three centres the youngest children are 18 months and the three remaining centres take preschool children only.

Table 2.5.1

Centres by Youngest Age Served

Province	Infants	Toddlers	Preschool	Total Centres
British Columbia	0	2	1	3
Alberta	1	1	1	3
Saskatchewan	0	1	0	1
Manitoba	2	2	1	5
Ontario	10	3	3	16
Quebec	31	16	2	49
Nova Scotia	0	0	1	1
Northwest Territories	1	0	0	1
Total	45	25	9	79

There is no licensed infant group care in British Columbia or Saskatchewan.

While these data indicate similarities with the tendency in community-based day care to provide a greater proportion of care to the older age groups, it appears to be much less pronounced in work-related day care. In other words, a substantial proportion of work-related day care programs (45 of 79, or 57 per cent) provide infant care. It is even higher in Ontario and Quebec, where 62 per cent of centres provide some infant care.

The picture is clarified by Table 2.5.2 below which portrays the data regarding the capacity for infant care and recent average enrollment in those centres which provide infant care.

Table 2.5.2

Number of Infants (under 18 months)
Served in Workplace Day Care Centres

Province	Capacity	Enrolled	Percentage
British Columbia	0	0	N/A
Alberta	6	6	100
Saskatchewan	0	0	N/A
Manitoba	16	15	94
Ontario	85	79	93
Quebec	287	259	90
Nova Scotia	0	0	N/A
Northwest Territories	*	3	N/A
Total	394	362	92

* No standards for day care

As the table indicates, there are a total of 394 spaces licensed for infant care, serving an average of 362 children. This represents almost 12 per cent of the total enrollment in work-related day care. This compares with the proportion of infant care in community-based centres across Canada, which is less than eight per cent of the total spaces.

It appears that there is a considerable demand for infant care and that sponsoring institutions are prepared to support the rapid return of women to the workforce following maternity leave. Many of those programs which do not provide infant care nevertheless indicated that there was significant demand. In these cases, infant care was not provided because of licensing restrictions (British Columbia and Saskatchewan do not permit group infant care), lack of space or cost.

Similarly, data regarding spaces for toddlers were not readily available since the statistics which are compiled federally define the youngest age category as under two years or twenty-four months. It was not possible to determine the number of children 18 months to 24 months who are normally included in the toddler age group. It should be noted that infant care in work-related day care centres refers to those children 18 months or younger whereas community-based infant care is based on the number of spaces available for children under 24 months. This would suggest that the proportion of infant care in work-related centres is even more favourable relative to community-based care than is suggested above.

2.6 Fees

Table 2.6.1 below sets out the range of weekly fees by age group for each province. For Ontario and Quebec, where there are a sufficient number of programs and therefore rates, median weekly fees were also included. While adequate comparative data for community-based centres were not readily

available, the respondents in the sample survey of 42 programs did not indicate significant differences. Five respondents indicated that their fees were higher than those in centres in the surrounding community, 18 had comparable fees, 16 had lower, but only 3 substantially so, and 3 respondents indicated that their programs were the only ones in the community and thus could not indicate comparative costs.

Table 2.6.1

Range of Fees by Province (Weekly $)

Province	Infant	Toddler	Preschool
British Columbia	N/A	46-90	35-70
Alberta	68	66-69	61-69
Saskatchewan	N/A	61	61
Manitoba	39-108	39-108	39-67
Ontario	72-120	55-110	50-90
(median)	(110)	(90)	(79)
Quebec	45-86	45-86	45-78
(median)	(62)	(63)	(63)
Nova Scotia	N/A	N/A	60
Northwest Territories	0	0	0

Note: It should be noted that for centres with a sliding fee scale, the fee was established at the mid-point.

It is difficult to draw any substantive conclusions from the above table other than to note the wide variation in rates within provinces and between Ontario and Quebec, where it was possible to establish median rates for each. With regard to the latter, the difference appears to be due to the level of government operating grants and other forms of support provided by the sponsoring organization. Nevertheless, the differences between community-based and work-related care do not appear to be substantial.

Finally, three of the programs charged fees on a sliding scale based on income to enable some level of equitable access to the services by all employees. In eight centres, higher fees were charged to non-employee users of the program. Of these, two centres charged significantly higher rates to community users, as much as $60 or $100 per month more. In both cases, this was to ensure that sponsor support was benefitting the targeted group.

2.7 On-Going Support

The range of on-going support for work-related day care programs by employers varies tremendously. For example, one employer limits support for the centre to the provision of one representative on the Board of Directors of the day care centre. The employer does not pay for occupancy or other on-going costs. At another place in the spectrum, the Centre in Nanisivik is totally funded and supported by the company, which charges no user fees.

The table below indicates the nature of support and the number of programs which receive it. The inventory in Appendix A indicates other forms of support that each province receives.

Support is broken into four main categories: rent; other occupancy costs, which include utilities, repairs and maintenance; administrative and operating assistance, which includes accounting, food and laundry services and other in-kind services; and direct financial assistance, which includes direct funding to a program either by way of an operating grant, absorbing a centre's deficit or providing an interest-free loan.

Table 2.7.1

On-Going Support

Province	Rent	Other Occupancy	Administrative Assistance	Direct Financial Support
British Columbia	2	2	1	0
Alberta	2	2	2	1
Saskatchewan	1	1	0	0
Manitoba	3	3	3	2
Ontario	14	13	10	6
Quebec	44	36	16	4
Nova Scotia	1	1	1	1
Northwest Territories	1	1	1	1
Total	68	59	33	15

As the table above indicates, the most common form of on-going support is for occupancy costs, whether in the form of rent or other costs. This appears to be true across all of the provinces. This is followed by administrative assistance, and then, for fewer than 20 per cent of the centres, there is direct financial assistance.

Finally, other forms of support include assistance with fund-raising, extensive advertising, or research done on behalf of day care.

2.8 Other Employer-Supported Initiatives

While the majority of employers in Canada have chosen to help with the child care needs of their employees through the provision of group day care for children under the age of six, some employers have undertaken other initiatives which in their opinion better suit their circumstances, or in some cases, supplement their group programs. Supportive personnel policies which offer options to parents are becoming widely accepted. Various alternatives to day care, such as paid parental leave, flexible working hours, job-sharing and paid leave to care for ill children have become part of the lexicon of human resource managers.

2.8.1 Parental Leave

In Quebec, Manitoba and Ontario, provincial government employees who qualify are now entitled to paid maternity leave at 93 per cent of full salary for twenty weeks. In Quebec, a flexible parental leave policy for provincial employees allows either parent to take up to two years unpaid leave and retain her/his job. These kinds of supports to working families can provide choices for some parents in selected workplaces.

Many other families who remain in the workplace may need some form of assistance in finding and maintaining child care. The Government of Ontario established day care counselling service as part of its employee assistance program in 1976. Soon after rejecting a proposal to set up a work-related day care centre for Queen's Park employees, the Province appointed a day care counsellor. The role of the counsellor is to assist any provincial or Crown Corporation employee in finding and choosing day care. In the initial stages, the counsellor travelled extensively throughout the province and met with individual parents and various groups, including union locals and affirmative action groups, all within the provincial civil service.

The main trust of the service is to encourage parents to visit centres and to "shop around" for the type of care that they want, whether it is in a centre or a private home. While the counselling service itself is free to provincial employees, the high on-going cost of child care was cited as a problem to parents.

2.8.2 Supplementary and Alternative Forms of Care

At least five employers support some form of care for school age children, either on a regular basis or during school holidays and professional development days. A number of other centres mentioned that the need for this care was an area they were hoping to address in the future. The Edmonton Hospital Workers Childcare Society have a supervised family day care program to which all requests for infant, school-age, and evening, weekend or overnight care are referred.

Just as employers are searching for creative ways to meet the child care needs of employees, some providers of child care are initiating services which they anticipate employers may find attractive and practical. Family Daycare Services, a large voluntary organization which supervises more than 300 children in private home day care in Toronto, has recently developed the Working Families Assurance Plan which it is actively marketing. According to this plan, the employer can purchase a range of services, including information and referral, nanny recruitment and private home day care, for a fixed fee which is calculated according to the number of employees in the company. In return, the employee pays a reduced fee for some of the services and may receive others, such as information and referral, at no extra charge. For the employer, this service does not involve significant capital outlays. Although this service has been available for more than one year, it is not known which companies have purchased it.

Victoria Day Care Service in Toronto is offering a new program called Home Helpers, which provides short-term supervised child care in the child's home. This service is intended to respond to the needs of parents whose children are ill or whose regular caregiver is ill. An employer may purchase this service, which can be available to parents upon short notice, in an attempt to reduce absenteeism. These child care programs provide an additional option for employers who do not choose to establish group day care centres.

3.0 POLICIES AND PROGRAMS OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE UNIONS

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report reviews the recent policies, programs and initiatives of the three levels of government with respect to work-related day care. Also included in this section is a consideration of recent policies and initiatives of the union movement, which appears to be the only other institution actively involved in work-related day care.

This section of the report, like the previous one, is largely descriptive, providing the ground work necessary to a considered discussion of the issues and policy implications set out in subsequent sections. The policies and programs of government considered in this section include many which are of general application, that is, they apply to community-based as well as work-related day care. In fact, most policy approaches consider the latter as subsumed within the former. It is important, nevertheless, to have a summary understanding of these policies and programs in order to assess their impact and implications for future policy development.

3.2 Federal Government

The federal government is currently involved in child care services, broadly defined, in two distinct ways. The first is through the financial support of the Canada Assistance Plan and the Income Tax Act. Second, the government in its role as an employer, has developed supportive personnel policies and facilitated the provision of on-site group day care centres. Both of these elements have an impact on work-related day care.

Through the Canada Assistance Plan (C.A.P.), the federal government shares the cost of child care services made available to low-income families and families with special needs. Under the terms of C.A.P., while the federal government provides funding, each province negotiates the type of child care service which will be cost-shared and the way in which user fees will be determined. In 1983, it is estimated that the federal government spent $75 million on day care services through C.A.P.[3] Thirty-two out of the sample of 42 employer-sponsored centres indicated that they are currently providing care to children of parents whose income is low enough to be eligible for subsidies. It should be noted, however, that these parents would be eligible for subsidies whether their child was in either a work-related or a community-based day care program.

The federal government is also involved in financing child care services through the Income Tax Act, which allows families to deduct up to $2000 per child to a maximum of $8000 per family for child care provided in or out of the child's home. In 1983-84, it is estimated that the federal government spent $105 million through this program.[4] Presumably, most consumers of work-related day care, as taxpayers, can make use of these provisions but again, this is irrespective of whether it is work-related or another form of care. The federal government also provides child care subsidies for people enrolled in training courses under the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission.

It is important to note that some current provisions within the Income Tax Act may allow employers to reduce the cost of providing child care services to employees under certain circumstances. A discussion of the issues related to taxation is contained in the next section on issues.

In its role as employer, the federal government has developed personnel policies which support the needs of working families and has initiated a pilot project to assist employees in establishing day care centres in federally owned or leased buildings. Federal employees may take maternity leave for up to twenty-six weeks after the birth of a child and are entitled to return to their own position. Women may use vacation, sick time and compensatory leave as part of their maternity leave. In some occupational categories, either parent may take up to five consecutive years unpaid leave for the care of a preschool child. While parents are not guaranteed retention of their jobs, they are given priority in hiring. This provision for leave offers options which may postpone the need for child care.

In addition to these parental leave policies which mostly benefit parents of very young children, some federal government employees may take up to five days paid leave per year to respond to family emergencies. This policy likely benefits a wide range of families in many work settings.

In 1981, Treasury Board approved a pilot project to support the establishment of up to four day care centres in federal facilities. This initiative enabled the Department of Public Works to conduct renovations and the selected federal departments to provide on-going occupancy costs including utilities and maintenance. The intent of the program was to establish separate, non-profit centres which parent-users would operate independently. Under this program, three centres were established, one each by the National Film Board in Montreal, the Ministry of the Environment in Downsview, a suburb of Toronto, and the Canada Employment and Immigration Centre in Hull.

In August 1984, an evaluation of the three pilot centrs was completed. Although the results are not yet available, the three centres continue to be fully operative. One of the three centres has expanded services to include spaces for children needing emergency care.

To date, the federal government has not initiated specific policies or programs which encourage other employers to support child care services for their employees. The issues involved in the different roles that the federal government might assume in providing incentives to other employers will be discussed in the next section on issues.

3.3 Provincial Governments

The provincial governments, like the federal government, have a dual role with respect to the provision of day care services: their governmental role and their role as an employer. Their role as a government is more extensive than that of the federal government insofar as they are responsible for policies governing the delivery as well as the funding of day care. Each province controls licensing standards and operational regulations as well as the formulae and levels of funding for day care. While these responsibilities for most provinces refer to day care broadly defined, Ontario and Quebec also have policies which encourage work-related day care. In its role as employer, provincial governments, like the federal government, may facilitate the provision of direct services as well as maintain supportive personnel policies.

All provinces have licensing standards and operational regulations governing day care (although the Northwest Territories currently does not) but none distinguishs between work-related and community-based day care, that is, day care broadly defined. With respect to policies regarding funding, three areas may be distinguished: subsidies for low-income parents, capital and start-up grants, and operating and maintenance funding.

First, as noted earlier, the provinces and territories participate in a cost-sharing arrangement with the federal government under the Canada Assistance Plan to assist with day care fees of low-income families. The eligibility criteria, numbers served, and level of subsidy are determined by each province and are, in this context, of general application, that is, they do not distinguish between work-related and community-based day care.

Second, while there has been a growing interest in the area, there are few policies, particularly to provide incentives to encouarge employers to initiate programs. One exception is the province of Ontario. In 1983, a background paper entitled "Work-Related Child Care Support For Families" was completed for the Ministry of Community and Social Services. One of the recommendations was to consider "providing start-up grants to interested employers who wish to establish workplace daycare centres." In June, 1984, the Ontario Minister of Community and Social Services announced a capital funding program of $390 000 to assist with the creation of new work-related day care centres in selected parts of the province. To date, seven projects have received approval for funding.

This new capital program was in addition to Ontario's Day Care Initiatives Program which provides limited capital and start-up grants on a selective basis to organizations which are non-profit and which contribute a portion of the funding. Prior to this new capital program, no private sector companies had applied. However, although one private company is currently being funded, the program is largely responding to requests from the public sector.

The province of Quebec provides a range of financial assistance to day care programs. These are also extended to programs which are work-related day care. L'Office des services de garde à l'enfance has a long-term objective of achieving a universal network of day care services for all parents who need or want them. A variety of funding mechanisms exists to assist with the start-up and on-going costs of all non-profit day care

programs with parent-controlled boards of directors. The Office believes that parents should have a choice of day care near the home or near the workplace. In this regard, while it supports day care in or near the workplace, it does not encourage a distinction in the utilization of the spaces between employees and the community. Thus it may be more appropriately termed community-based day care in or near a worksite.

It does, nevertheless, encourage workplace day care. As a result of a union-management study on availability of day care spaces initiated during negotiations with the Common Front Union in 1978, Quebec adopted a policy to encourage public sector employers to make space available for day care centres whether the need arises from employees or the community at large. Since 1980, when the study was completed, 13 day care centres have been established in public sector buildings in Quebec which are used by both public sector employees and the community at large. It should be noted that all but one of the 29 centres set up in the period 1976-80 were at public sector locations.

With regard to the role of government as employer, the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario are involved in day care centres for their employees. However, these centres were established as a result of either individual efforts, or union negotiations and not as part of any formal government policy. In Manitoba, Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, efforts in support of child care for employees have been initiated. In British Columbia, the recently established Valleyview Childcare Centre came about as a result of bargaining between the government and the British Columbia Government Employees Union. The government's role as employer was limited to making available free space. Start-up money for the Centre came from the Employee Benefit Trust Fund which had been established by a previous government.[5]

In Ontario, there are three day care centres that serve provincial employees. They are all in regional treatment centres, the space for which is provided free of cost, and were established as a result of individual efforts rather than any specific policy of the government. However it is interesting to note that in 1983, the Women's Directorate of Ontario, reporting to the Office of the Deputy Premier, conducted a survey of over 5000 provincial government employees in various municipalities and regions to determine their attitudes towards day care. The majority of respondents were in favour of the government reviewing its role and assisting employees with child care.

The provincial government of Manitoba is currently making space available and contributing capital funds to a provincial employee group which is starting a day care centre. The provincial government in Newfoundland is in the process of establishing a day care centre for its employees. In Saskatchewan, the issue is on the bargaining table for fall negotiations with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU).

A summary by province of both general and specific programs and policies, as well as the total number of group and private day care spaces is set out in Appendix B.

It seems reasonable to conclude that, while there are initiatives both in the policy and program areas and with respect to provincial employees, they remain limited. However, additional new initiatives are anticipated in response, it would appear, from both provincial employees and other employers and employees in both the private and public sectors.

3.4 Municipal Governments

In most provinces in Canada, the local level of government has no formal role in the funding or provision of day care services. However, local elected officials often view themselves as the "front line problem-solvers" whom local constituents ask for help. In the few jurisdictions in which municipalities or regions have a formal role in the delivery and/or funding of day care services, a number of initiatives have been taken.

In Alberta, a number of municipalities are involved in the funding and/or direct provision of day care services. Calgary and Medicine Hat directly operate day care programs; Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, and several smaller municipalities contribute municipal funds toward the operation of day care centres. These municipal funds are provided in addition to the C.A.P. funding for low-income families. Because recent reports indicate that there is a twenty per cent vacancy rate in most day care centres in Alberta there appears to be no immediate need for the municipalities to encourage employers to initiate day care programs. It is interesting to note that the City of Calgary is considering including on-site workplace day care for its employees in the new City Hall complex. (At the time of writing, no final decision had been made.)

In Ontario, municipalities and regions are expected to contribute twenty per cent of the cost of subsidized care. In addition, many directly operate day care centres and private home services for their community. In the early 1970s, in an attempt to increase the availability of day care services throughout the province, provincial capital grants were made available to local municipalities. Provincial grants covered 100 per cent of the initial capital costs. From an examination of the growth of full-time licensed group day care spaces from 1971-76 one can infer that the existence of the capital grants was a major factor in the expansion of municipally operated day care services in Ontario. Nevertheless, in the larger municipalities, the demand for day care far outstripped the supply of municipally operated spaces and the supply of commercial and non-profit centres also grew. However, beginning in 1980, the province placed additional restraints on funding, despite the continued growth in demand for service. This caused growth in municipally funded spaces to fail to keep pace with demand.

Faced with the recognition that additional day care services were required, the City of Toronto established its own Task Force on Workplace Daycare in 1982, primarily in order to create more spaces. The City, building upon its pattern of supporting equal opportunity for women, and handicapped and visible minorities, had established its own workplace day care in City Hall in the fall of 1980. Response to this initiative was significant. City Council saw an opportunity to maximize its role as a "model employer" and as controller of urban development. Council established the Task Force in early 1982 and appointed members from the business community and the day care community, and two of its own representatives. The Task Force assisted its full-time coordinator in encouraging other employers to create or support additional day care services in a time of constraint. The Task Force sought to educate other major employers about the need for day care in the workplace and to offer technical assistance to those who choose to support such services. Throughout the two-year period of its existence, the staff and

members of the Task Force provided various levels of information and technical assistance to more than sixty employers in the public, private, and voluntary sectors. By promoting the concept of work-related day care and by educating employers about the need for day care, the City hoped to increase the supply.

While the City does not have a formal role in day care (this role is fulfilled by Metropolitan Toronto, of which the City of Toronto is but one jurisdiction), it clearly plays a pivotal role in land use planning. From its inception, the Task Force maintained close links with the Department of Planning and Development, which reviews all proposals for major new developments. The coordinator worked closely with planners to determine the feasibility and suitability of workplace day care in prospective developments.

Council hoped that it could achieve some of its goals for more day care spaces by working with developers as they planned new construction. Provisions within the Official Plan of the City encourage the development of community services, park lands, and assisted housing units. Specific provisions exist which allow City Council (with the ultimate approval of the Ontario Municipal Board) to make exceptions to the by-laws governing density of construction in certain areas of the city. These exceptions or trade-offs are known as density bonuses. For example, in the Central Core of the city, Council can approve a development in which density exceeds that which is permitted in the Official Plan if the development provides a non-profit community service. This service, which could be a day care centre, is a benefit to the public which the developer provides in exchange for additional allowances from the City.

In theory, this provision can help to meet the need for community service facilities. In practice, however, there has been extremely limited use of it. From the developer's viewpoint, the provision for bonuses in the plan could lead to unfair or unequal assessment of a development proposal. Some developers believe that the provision for density bonuses could possibly force them into providing a community service even if this is not their preferred option. Several developers in Toronto have expressed concern about erecting facilities while having limited assurance that the on-going service provided in the facility is effective and of high quality. This concern may arise when the developer plans to build a structure, lease it to a management company, and have no further direct involvement. In these situations, the public may identify the work-related day care centre with the developer, yet the developer may be quite removed from its operation. For one large developer, the public image of his company's involvement in day care was a serious concern. The developer wanted assurance, in the form of a written agreement, that steps would be taken to ensure that the day care centre was well run and would not reflect negatively upon the corporate profile of his company.

Urban planners and politicians also have expressed concerns about the use of density bonuses as a means of obtaining more day care spaces. From a theorectical planning perspective, any measure which weakens the overall plan for a balanced commercial and residential pattern of its development is viewed with caution. Planners are extremely concerned that density bonuses could be seen as a way to "buy" extra concessions and thereby erode the intent of the planning process. Some planners have considered the idea of a levy for community services which could be equitably assessed on all developments instead of a density bonus which is subject to an individual, case-by-case evaluation.

While the City of Toronto initiative did not rely upon the Official Plan provisions offering density bonuses to developers to achieve the creation of additional day care spaces, the City staff did utilize the regular channels of the development review process to encourage developers to include on-site day care. This proved to be an effective strategy. In addition to providing various levels of assistance to more than sixty employers in the public, private and voluntary sectors, the coordinator(s) of work-related day care in conjunction with the Department of Planning and Development negotiated formal commitment for the creation of four work-related day care centres.

Harbourfront, an extensive commercial-residential development, opened its own workplace day care in September, 1984. By 1990, it is expected that Campeau Corporation will have completed the day care centre within Scotia Plaza, the new headquarters of the Bank of Nova Scotia in the financial core of downtown Toronto, and another centre within Waterpark Place, a mixed commercial/residential development on the waterfront, approximately one quarter mile from the financial core.

As part of expanding its corporate headquarters downtown, Canada Life Assurance Co. has agreed to build a centre for its employees and the surrounding community, while a separate parent-directed organization will manage the program. According to the final agreement, Canada Life will build and equip a new, non-profit day care centre for a minimum of 41 children, adjacent to its corporate headquarters and steps away from public transit and company parking. The company also agreed to provide the building rent-free for 25 years to the non-profit organization, to pay for promotional and start-up costs for the six months prior to opening, and to absorb any deficit which would be incurred during the first six months of operation. However, the company did not want to assume any other occupancy costs, estimated to be approximately $36 000 per year for this new building.

It is estimated that Campeau's commitment is worth at least $750 000 in 1984. While the City and Campeau have a master agreement, it is based on Campeau's good faith.

In a similar initiative at the local level, Human Services Scarborough sponsored the Scarborough Workplace Day Care Project. The purpose of this short-term project was to provide consultation to employers about work-related day care. Funded under Canada Works as a federal job creation project, this initiative originated within the human services organizations that were aware of the need for additional day care in this large suburban municipality. As the fastest growing area municipality within the Metro federation, Scarborough is attracting many new light industries and is actively recruiting large corporations to the area surrounding the "town centre" which is approximately twelve miles from Toronto's downtown core. Because the six-month duration of the project was relatively short, the focus was largely educational and promotional. The Mayor of Scarborough and the Scarborough Business Association endorsed this initiative, which operated independently from the City. In August, 1984, the draft report of the project concluded that there was a need to continue public education with a wide range of employers and that the companies which had expressed an interest would welcome technical assistance in exploring the costs and feasibility of various work-related day care options. As the sponsoring organization, Human Services Scarborough recommended that the next phase of the project work more closely with the Planning and Economic Development of the City of Scarborough.

The City of Vancouver has used the provision of the zoning by-law that allows for density bonuses to developments which include public benefits. The Vancouver model is similar to the approach used in Toronto in that both use the development review process as a way to create more day care spaces. However, in Vancouver, no specific attempt was made to involve the employer or major tenant in a development. In suburban Marpole, British Columbia, a developer agreed to build, to finish to licensing standards, and to provide free space to a non-profit day care centre in exchange for the right to add an extra floor of office space to the building. Built in approximately 1976, Shannon Daycare is a licensed non-profit society which provides care for twenty-five children in the area, but gives no special priority for employees. In southeast Vancouver, the city used it own funds and provisions of the density bonus to ensure that day care was included in a new housing complex that originally had no provision for day care.

From this brief review, it appears that the municipalities, particularly in Alberta, Ontario and British Columbia have played an instrumental role in the development of day care services. Local initiatives in the Toronto area and in Vancouver have attempted to achieve social objectives through the process of land use control. The promotion of work-related day care in Toronto has had some influence on the spectrum of day care services.

3.5 Union Policies and Initiatives

The role of unions in the development of work-related day care continues to evolve. As female membership in unions across the country has increased, women have pressed to place child care high on the list of priorities. Whereas their U.S. counterparts were involved in efforts to obtain more day care services starting in the early 1970s, most Canadian trade unions are beginning to address the issue now, in the eighties.

The British Columbia Government Union's pioneering steps to establish the first union-sponsored, union-funded child care facility in Canada in 1971 was the exception and not the rule.[6] By 1980, both the Canadian Labour Congress and the Canadian Union of Public Employees developed formal policy statements on day care/child care. These policies urge the various provincial and federal governments to create a universally accessible, publicly funded, not-for-profit, government-financed, non-compulsory, high quality, comprehensive child care system and to recognize universal access "...as an essential social right of all families wishing to use the service."[7] Work-related day care is described as one component of this comprehensive system.

A review of union initiatives undertaken in recent years reveals a potpourri of approaches to helping parents meet their child care needs. Some unions have bargained for a range of flexible leave provisions which enable workers to take paid leave to care for ill children and to adopt children. Three large unions, the Common Front, in 1980, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and Canadian Union of Postal Workers in 1982, negotiated paid parental leave for either parent. While paid parental leave provides a real option for parents when children are very young, it does not help to create affordable, quality child care which many families need within two years of

the date of the child's birth.[8] CUPE 2189 and the YWCA of Metropolitan Toronto negotiated one of the first contracts to include provisions dealing with child care. The YWCA, as a decentralized, small employer had investigated on-site day care and found that it was not feasible because the small staff of less than 100 people would not have enough children to sustain a centre. In recognition of the high cost of child care, the YWCA agreed to provide a monthly cash payment which would help to defray the high cost of quality child care. Currently, each employee with one or more children under 12 years of age receives $30.00 per month for the first child, and $10.00 for each additional child. While this allowance is a taxable benefit to the employee, the employer views it as an important, albeit somewhat symbolic recognition of the needs of working families. In this particular example, the employer considers the provision of additional support to working families an integral part of the organization's overall objectives.

In recent years, several negotiated settlements have included specific provisions for the creation of licensed day care programs. The joint collaboration of the Alberta Nursing Association, the Alberta Hospital Association and several locals of the Canadian Union of Public Employees resulted in the establishment of the only work-related day care program in Canada sponsored by a consortium of employers. In 1979, as part of a strike settlement, several major hospitals in Edmonton agreed to form a joint committee with representative unions to establish a non-profit day care centre which would serve hospital employees and the community and which would be a self-sustaining operation.

In 1982, the program responded to the need for infant care by establishing supervised private home day care near the hospital. While this program primarily serves children of employees in the group centre, the home day care program also serves the needs of many other families in the community, especially those needing care during extended hours. Like other licensed day care programs in Alberta, the Edmonton Hospital Workers Daycare Centre receives significant operating grants from the province which help to reduce fee increases to parents.

As noted earlier, the province of British Columbia and the BCGEU negotiated an agreement to establish a joint committee to establish a pilot child care facility in the greater Vancouver area. The province limited its contribution to the provision of suitable space in government-owned or leased space that could be adapted to child care. The agreement stipulated that the funding be obtained from the Employee Benefit Trust Fund. In June, 1983, Valleyview Child Care Centre was opened. While the centre gives priority to employees of Valleyview Hospital, it also serves the community. The centre is operated by the YMCA for the BCGEU. Day care staff of Valleyview Child Care Centre are members of BCGEU as well. The agreement included the commitment to evaluate the project on an on-going basis and may provide for the establishment of other child care facilities in other areas of the province.

United Auto Workers has recently negotiated two settlements which include clauses pertaining to child care. In December, 1983, Local 1325 in Stratford, Ontario, and American Motors Corporation agreed to establish a day care fund which would be used to set up a day care centre at or near the AMC plant. AMC agreed to contribute two cents per worker hour per year; the total is approximately $48 000 in the first year. Local 1325 intends to operate a

non-profit centre and to accommodate the needs of 1200 shift workers, most of whom are women. This negotiated settlement appears to be unique in Canada in that it is the first time that a large private sector employer has formally committed funds to child care as a direct result of collective bargaining. UAW's recent settlement with Ford Motor Company in Scarborough, Ontario, also includes provisions for "...a model child care program." Although this commitment is one of a number of significant concessions which UAW won after a short strike in October, 1984, there is no stipulated commitment for funding from Ford.

These negotiated settlements are examples of the proactive role that UAW has taken in other issues related to the quality of working life. UAW officials who are engaged in implementing these child care programs acknowledge that collective bargaining is a powerful tool in obtaining the support of the employer. In the subsequent stages of implementation, however, it appears that the UAW will face the same dilemmas that other non-profit day care boards face: the challenge of securing suitable space, paying reasonable salaries on union scales, and setting affordable fees.

In Quebec, the Common Front's efforts to obtain additional day care services has had a significant impact. In 1978, the public sector unions, which bargain collectively with the Government of Quebec, gained management's commitment to participate in a joint day care committee. The committee, composed of representatives from several ministries and various unions, recommended that 5000 new day care spaces be created over a three-year period. In order to facilitate this growth, the committee recommended that provincial ministries and agencies make space in existing facilities available to parent committees wishing to establish day care centres.

While these centres are located in workplaces such as hospitals, community health centres, and residential treatment facilities, the centres are intended to serve the community as well as employees of that workplace. The local management of the facility may, if it so chooses, support the centre financially and/or give priority enrollment to children of employees. This joint labour-management initiative in Quebec has had the effect of expanding services for all families through the use of space in the workplace. The inventory of day care centres indicates that a high proportion of programs that have been established since 1980, especially those outside greater Montreal, are located in public sector worksites.

4.0 ISSUES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter of the report reviews the key issues regarding work-related day care. The issues were identified, defined and articulated on the basis of the findings of the survey, in particular, the views and comments of various directors of work-related day care programs and the provincial government directors of day care, as well as the small but growing literature on the subject and the experience of the authors. There are a number of issues which, for purposes of presentation, have been organized around three broader topics or themes:

- the comparative advantages and disadvantages of work-related group day care -- particularly with respect to community-based day care -- for the user, the employer and the general public;
- the alternatives to on-site group care, currently the most prevalent form of work-related day care;
- the factors affecting the growth and development of work-related day care.

These three themes and the wide range of issues subsumed by them are organized to permit the development of a number of conclusions and for the definition of the implications of this study for the policy development process included in the next and final chapter.

4.2 The Advantages and Disadvantages of Work-Related Day Care

This section considers the advantages and disadvantages of work-related day care from the perspective of the users and the sponsoring organizations. A number of issues were identified in the literature and in the course of this study. From both of these sources, a series of questions arose. These questions include: Does work-related day care meet the hourly needs of specific employee groups? Is work-related day care more affordable? Is it more accessible and convenient? Does it improve the quality of working life? It became apparent that in the literature there is limited information on the specific issues related to work-related day care in Canada. For example, the literature often cites reduced absenteeism and turnover as potential advantages of work-related day care. However, there has been virtually no formal evaluation of programs which substantiates this claim. One well documented study conducted in the United States[9] indicated lower absenteeism and turnover in employees enrolled in the Northside Child Development Centre. However, these employees were compared to those without formal child care arrangements, and those with no children. In order to more effectively determine the impact of work-related day care on such things as absenteeism and turnover among employees, one would have to compare employees using the work-related day care program with those using a community-based program.

The empirical data gathered in the in-depth interviews were used as a basis for elaboration of the commonly-cited issues. To some degree, these issues arise when work-related day care is compared to community-based day care. It was not possible within the terms of this study to determine directly the views of the users or the senior management within the sponsoring organizations regarding the advantages and disadvantages of work-related day care. Nevertheless, the potential advantages and disadvantages are identified and the key elements defined sufficiently to draw preliminary conclusions.

4.2.1 Hours of Operation

Work-related day care is often considered a solution to meet the needs of shift workers or people with unusual work schedules. Most community licensed group day care programs operate between approximately 7 am and 6 pm. Many parents cannot make use of these programs because they are not compatible

with their working hours. While there are notable exceptions, the majority of work-related day care programs operate on a five-day week during regular day-time hours and do not currently meet the specialized needs of employees in workplaces that operate during extended hours.

Twenty-six sponsor organizations in the sample are in operation 24 hours a day, yet only 9 day care centres are in operation beyond the regular hours. Four centres are open before 7 am, three have extended evening hours, and two centres have both early morning and extended evening care. Only one centre operates regularly on week-ends. The Edmonton Hospital Workers Centre established a supervised private home day care program to meet the needs for evening, week-end, and overnight care.

Seventeen centres indicated that there has been a demand to expand the hours of service. Cost was cited to be the major barrier to expansion. One company mentioned that, rather than extend the hours of the day care operation, it had made a policy decision to allow parents using the day care program to work the shifts that were compatible with the day care program.

A number of centres noted that they had previously been open longer hours, but had cut back services due to low utilization rates and the high cost of sustaining the program. For example, the day care centre in Valleyview Hospital used to operate until 12 p.m. on a regular basis. Since this was not found to be cost-effective, the centre now closes at 6 p.m. However, extended service for either evening or week-end care can be arranged if two or more parents request it.

The provision of day care on a part-time basis is being offered by 36 centres. More centres enroll children for part-week than for part-day. This flexibility in scheduling would certainly help meet the day care needs of part-time workers.

It would appear that workplace day care is not significantly different from community-based day care in meeting the needs of those with work schedules which do not conform to normal working hours.

This is particularly the case where the parent is on a rotating shift. The child population, which requires off-hours care, particularly in any single enterprise is, in most cases, too small and too unstable to permit the development and operation of cost-effective group care for them. The solution lies elsewhere, either with private-home day care or a central community-based facility which services the broader community.

4.2.2 User Fees

There appears to be little difference in the cost to the user of work-related group day care in comparison with community-based day care. As set out in chapter two, weekly fees can range from a low of about $40 to a high of $120. While comparative fees for community-based care were not readily available, interviews from the sample of programs did not indicate a significant difference overall. In the sample of 42 centres, five respondents indicated that their fees were higher than those in the surrounding community, 18 had comparable fees and 16 were lower, although only three were considered

to be substantially lower. It is interesting to note that these three latter programs were all sponsored by employers in the private sector. Finally, in three instances, the work-related program was the only program in the community and there was no comparison to be made.

While most employers or sponsors provide contributions to the cost of the centres, in a large majority of cases the assistance is limited to capital, start-up and occupancy costs. In a number of cases these contributions are offset by the high capital and occupancy costs resulting from locations in expensive downtown buildings. More important, however, is the fact that staff salaries normally account for 80 per cent or more of a day care budget, and occupancy and capital depreciation and expense costs represent a relatively minor portion of the overall budget. As a consequence, the on-going contributions and indirect services from employers may only marginally reduce day care fees.

The average fees vary significantly from province to province. The average infant fee in work-related centres in Ontario is $110 per week while in Quebec it is $61 per week. The major factor regarding differences in fees would appear to be the provision of operating grants. For example, Quebec centres in existence in 1983 received a total of about $9.50 per day or $47.50 per week in operating grants for infants. While variations in staff-child ratios can account for significant differences in costs, clearly, the operating grant covers the difference in this instance in infant fees between Quebec and Ontario. Thus, in the provinces where there are no direct operating grants, affordability was cited as a major problem. However, this is a problem which cuts across both work-related and community-based day care.

4.2.3 Location

In terms of convenience of location, all centres in the sample were easily accessible to employees. Thirty-one centres were on-site, and ten were within a five-minute walk. One centre, which is in a very remote area, is located a mile from the workplace. A shuttle bus operates between the two to alleviate any transportation problems. However, a few centres noted that while they were located in close proximity to the headquarters of the organization, it was not necessarily convenient for parents working in other branches of the organization. It seems reasonable to conclude that, in most instances, work-related day care may save travelling time for parents. In addition to this time-saving factor, supervisors mentioned that proximity to the child in cases of illness or emergency was an important advantage to many parents. Also, a number of parents made use of the close proximity to visit their child during the day.

On the other side of the issue, the literature contains documentation which, although methodologically contentious, clearly indicates that parental preference is predominantly for neighbourhood care. Recently, both Saskatchewan and Manitoba conducted studies which found parents generally preferred neighbourhood care. The reasons are not difficult to find: workplace day care means travel with a child in rush-hour traffic; parents lack of 'wind-down' time before and after work; the separation of children from neighbourhood friends and school-aged siblings; and finally, the potentially detrimental effect of some workplaces on the child's health.

From the point of view of the employer, the interviews with centre directors indicated that location or proximity was not particularly advantageous except as perhaps one of many factors which contribute to improved performance. Nor were there significant disadvantages to the question of location although some problems were cited: four respondents indicated that the loss of space was a problem; three hospitals found an increase in the level of noise disturbing to patients, and some felt that parents tended to leave work more readily if the child became ill during the day. Overall, these problems did not appear to be insurmountable and thus cannot be considered significant.

4.2.4 Meeting Employee Demand

A key concern with respect to work-related day care is whether or not it meets the demand among employees, both overall and for specific types of care. While it was not possible within the scope of this study to accurately define employee demand or to provide overall comparative measures with community-based care, it is possible to provide a rudimentary assessment based on program waiting lists[10] and enrollment/capacity ratios and to compare certain components of demand.

Thirty-three of the 42 centres in our sample had waiting lists ranging in length from four to over 100 children. However, almost one-half of these centres had enrollments of less than 90 per cent. Most centres indicated that their waiting lists were mainly for infant or toddler spaces while they had vacancies in the preschool group. Many centres indicated that there were timing problems, that is, getting children of the right age into the program at the time parents needed it. Three centres, all in the private sector, were for the exclusive use of employees and were over 90 per cent enrolled and had waiting lists. However, each of these centres reported waiting lists of between 40 and 50 children, indicating that many employees were not able to take advantage of day care programs at their workplace.

One area where rough comparisons may be made is that of infant care. According to the report, "Status of Daycare in Canada, 1983," there were only 8322 spaces for children under two in group day care, representing approximately eight per cent of the total group care. It is not possible to determine exactly how many children under the age of two are currently being served in work-related day care centres since infants are generally defined to be under the age of 18 months and the toddler grouping varies from province to province. It is known, however, that 45 of 79 work-related centres care for children under 18 months, representing almost 12 per cent of total spaces. Sixty-nine centres care for children in the toddler category.

From the sample of 42 centres, 26 provide infant care and 40 provide for toddlers. Of the 16 centres with no infant care, 12 indicated that there was demand for it. The reasons for not providing it included licensing restrictions, high costs and lack of space. Centres with infant care consistently mentioned the difficulty of meeting the high demand for care of that age group. It should be noted that there is no licensed group infant care in British Columbia, Saskatchewan or Newfoundland.

While the majority of programs give priority enrollment to employees and some have quotas, only 12 of the 79 centres care exclusively for the children of employees. Most work-related day care programs, in addition to serving employees, provide a valuable resource to the community at large. In 29 centres the majority of users were not employees of the sponsor organization. Specifically, out of a total of 3126 children currently enrolled in employer-sponsored centres, 1374 spaces or 44 per cent are occupied by children of non-employees. Three centres in the sample noted that their program provided the only day care in the area.

While it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions regarding the extent to which employee demand is met, there are clearly a number of centres where significant demand goes unmet. However, this is also clearly the case with community-based day care. Moreover, it appears that work-related day care meets a higher proportion (although not all) of the demand for infant care than does community-based care. Finally, it also provides additional spaces for non-employees in the surrounding community.

4.2.5 Quality of Care

With regard to the quality of care, it was not possible within the scope of this study to provide a detailed assessment of the quality of care in work-related day care. The issue of quality care is far too complex to easily assess these centres or even to provide comparisons with community-based care without an in-depth analysis of the care provided in a number of selected community-based and work-related centres and on a longitudinal basis at that. Discussed below are some rough indicators which provide some sense of the quality of work-related day care.

Twelve respondents in the sample of 42 centres mentioned that the high quality of care in their centres had been a significant factor in the parent's decision to use the program. A number of centres indicated that they exceeded the minimum provincial staffing requirements. While an enriched staff complement is not necessarily an indication of the quality of a program, it may well be evidence of a direct effort to meet the needs of children, parents and staff. Similarly, the evidence related to staff salaries in work-related day care is useful to note. Of the 42 centres interviewed, 16 centres reported that their salaries were, on average, higher than other day care salaries in their area. This may be a factor in the centre's ability to attract and retain good day care staff.

The literature on day care refers to parental involvement as one measure of the quality of care. In this regard, 18 of 42 respondents in the sample remarked that they noted a greater involvement by parents than was their experience in other centres. The majority of programs (34) had some amount of parental involvement.

From the sample, 32 had parents on the Board of Directors, twenty-seven had parents serving on various committees, four had parents regularly participating in the classroom, and, in five centres, parents were involved in special activities such as field trips. When asked how useful this involvement was, 26 supervisors found it very useful, seven found it somewhat useful, and only two indicated that it was not useful.

On the negative side, mention was made of the potentially detrimental effect that certain worksites might have on the health of the child although no specific sites were identified. From the above, it would appear that the quality of work-related day care is at least equivalent to that of community-based care.

4.2.6 Corporate Development and the Quality of Working Life

There is very little information regarding the impact of the provision of work-related day care on job performance and the quality of life at work. In the absence of evaluations of work-related day care, the discussion remains descriptive and speculative. In the interviews with personnel from the sample of 42 programs, respondents were asked in an open-ended question, to indicate up to three advantages and three disadvantages of providing work-related day care. The results are summarized below. Each figure in the first column represents the number of respondents from the 42 programs who identified the advantage in the related row. Thus the percentage figure in the same row indicates the proportion of program personnel who selected this item.

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Improved Employee Morale	13	31
Reduces Absenteeism/Tardiness	13	31
Improves Corporate Image	12	29
Reduces Turnover	10	24
Improves Recruitment	8	19
Improves Job Performance	5	12
Don't Know	3	7
Total Responses	64	

The above results definitely do not constitute hard evidence since they reflect the views of day care staff and not company employees or management. However, the fact that they selected these items provides some rough indications and tends to confirm some of the views in the literature. In particular, almost one-third of the respondents indicated that the provision of work-related day care led to improved employee morale and reductions in absenteeism. Another 29 per cent indicated an improvement in corporate image while almost one-quarter suggested reduced turnover. Other responses included improved recruitment, job performance and employee/employer relations.

In terms of negative impact, 17 of the respondents (or 40 per cent) indicated that they had not observed any problems resulting from work-related day care. For the remaining 25 respondents a range of generally minor difficulties was raised. The most pertinent was with regard to the concern that only well-paid employees could afford to use the programs. Related concerns were raised about the potential conflict if care was not sufficiently accessible to parents who required it and with regard to non-users who

preferred other types of benefits. These issues were raised by fewer than five respondents and it is not clear whether, when explored, they would have significant implications.

4.3 Alternative Forms of Work-Related Day Care

Although employer-sponsored initiatives cover a range of benefits from paid parental leave to the direct provision of group care programs, alternatives to the latter have yet to loom large for those parents with preschool children who wish or need to continue working. One option, presented earlier, concerned the Metro Toronto YWCA's agreement to provide a monthly cash payment which would help to defray the high cost of quality child care. Currently, each employee with children under 12 years of age receives $30 per month (and $10 for each additional child). This payment for a single child constitutes, on average, less than 10 per cent of the cost of care and even less when it is recognized that the allowance is a taxable benefit. However, there appears to be little choice for a small employer.

It is interesting to note that other employers and/or unions have not chosen to institute similar allowances. Critics point out that if an allowance were sizeable, then it would increase the employee's taxable income and the net increase in disposable income for child care would be less than originally anticipated. From the employer's perspective, there would be no accountability mechanism to ensure that funds were effectively assisting parents in finding and keeping child care. Other advocates point out that in many areas, the level of child care services is so limited that even if parents have money to pay for day care, the service is not always available.

Other options might include the use of private-home day care both as a form of regular care and as a means of providing care to children of parents with working schedules which do not conform to the normal working day. However, a recent study of private-home day care in Ontario indicated that as a form of regular on-going care there is little difference in the costs between group and private-home day care.[11] Thus, it does not constitute any more of an alternative than does community-based day care, of which it is essentially one form. The study also found that private-home day care providers were not particularly inclined to provide care beyond normal working hours since, in most instances, it would interfere with their own home lives.[12]

There are exceptions to these findings in both Ontario and Alberta as demonstrated by the supervised family day care program operated by the Edmonton Hospital Workers Childcare Society. However, such examples do not appear to be widespread. Finally, other programs such as those being developed in Toronto by caregiver agencies, which may provide critical assistance in finding and supplementing care, do not constitute alternatives, low-cost or otherwise.

4.4 Factors Affecting the Development of Work-Related Day Care

There are a number of factors and issues affecting the development of work-related day care. Policies and initiatives which seek to support the future growth and development of work-related day care will have to hurdle some major barriers but will find some encouragement in the experience gained to date. The issues considered in this section are grouped around the following key themes:

- Regulatory Requirements
- Urban Development Initiatives
- Taxation
- Grants and Other Incentives
- Employer and Employee Attitudes

4.4.1 Regulatory Requirements

While several local efforts have fostered the growth of work-related day care services, other requirements may serve as barriers. In some cities and regions restrictive zoning laws limit the types of location in which day care may be established. Four out of ten provincial officials considered that restrictive zoning was a barrier. The cost of servicing new land and paying municipal property taxes, especially for new buildings, was also considered a significant barrier. While the employer may not think that she/he should have to pay these property taxes, the budget of the day care centre usually cannot absorb these costs without increasing fees to parents. These local requirements can serve as disincentives.

Provincial registration and licensing requirements are factors which may affect the development of work-related day care programs as well. Three of ten provincial officials stated that licensing requirements are a major factor affecting development of services. Specific requirements about the size of outdoor play areas and the height restrictions governing the location of centres can easily affect the development of services in high-density commercial areas. It may be costly or physically difficult to meet these standards. At the same time, licensing standards may help to ensure that child care programs are not established in unsafe or inappropriate worksites.

4.4.2 Urban Development Incentives

In both Toronto and Vancouver, planners have used the development review process and, in particular, density bonuses, as incentives to developers to provide workplace day care in newly constructed or renovated building developments.

However, while planners in these cities continue to rank day care as a high priority, they are reluctant to continue to advocate the use of the development review process as a major strategy for obtaining day care spaces. There are several reasons for this. First, this ad hoc process is not based on sound planning principles and, in the absence of clear-cut policy, may not accomplish what was intended. For example, in Vancouver, planners negotiated another exchange of density bonus for day care space. Because there was a

long lag between the agreement and actual construction, the developer lost interest in upholding his commitment. The City had no legal way to maintain involvement. At the time of construction, sufficient outdoor space was not allocated, so the indoor space could not be used for day care.

Similarly the process of securing the commitment of Canada Life Assurance Co. to build a day care centre as part of its redevelopment also highlighted some of the limitations of the development review process as a vehicle for achieving City objectives. First, City staff worked directly with developers and solicitors to establish the guidelines for the program. Because direct early involvement with the employer (human resource staff) was not the planning approach chosen by the company, decisions made about the size, age mix and financial viability of the centre were not based on a needs survey of employees. This process of working with "third parties" has the potential to yield decision-making that is not always in the best long-term interest of parents or children. According to the final agreement, Canada Life will build and equip a new, non-profit day care centre for a minimum of 41 children. However the company did not want to assume any other occupancy costs, which were estimated to be approximately $36 000 per year for this new building. City staff estimated that if the centre had to pay these other occupancy costs, then its ability to provide affordable day care to employees and the community while meeting City objectives for the salaries of day care workers would be seriously jeopardized. In this particular situation, the limitations of securing affordable workplace day care through the development review process became apparent. While this large company was willing to meet some of the City's objectives in a commendable manner, the company also expected this new service to fit into its pattern of providing employee services and benefits. It is not clear whether the day care can operate in a manner that meets both sets of objectives.

Nevertheless, there remain positive examples of the development review process in both Toronto and Vancouver. These were identified in section 3.4 above.

4.4.3 Taxation

Issues related to municipal property tax and federal income tax have been cited as factors affecting the development of work-related day care. Local initiatives in Vancouver and Toronto have identified the payment of municipal property taxes for work-related day care centres as a problematic issue. In one example, a large downtown employer agreed to construct a day care centre as part of a large redevelopment, and to lease it to a non-profit organization for minimal rent. The employer argued that the company should not be responsible for payment of property taxes. From the financial perspective of the day care centre, the payment of property tax can be a significant burden. In this situation, the annual property tax was equal to one full-time teaching salary. As a resolution, the local municipality agreed to apply to the province for private legislation which would exempt the portion of the property which houses the day care from taxation. While the local municipality had a direct involvement in establishing this work-related day care program, there was concern about weakening the local tax base.

The issues related to provisions within the Income Tax Act which allow employers to deduct some of the costs of child care services in some situations may be a factor that affects the development of services. Specifically, if an employer is considering establishing a program, she/he may choose a management option that enables the company to deduct certain costs as business expenses.[13]

If an employer who operates an incorporated company chooses to start a day care centre for its employees and decides to operate the centre as a department of the company, then the daily costs of operation, including salaries and food are considered current expenses. As such, these expenses are deductible. It is interesting to note that of the 79 centres in the inventory, seven are operated as departments of the sponsoring employer. Three of these employers are private sector companies which may be eligible to deduct these operating costs. One third of the private sector sponsors in the inventory have elected to operate their day care programs as departments of the organization.

In addition, it is possible that these companies may be eligible to deduct the capital expenditures according to the capital cost allowance scheme in the Income Tax Act.

Other provisions for incorporation enable employers that do not want to operate a day care program to establish a separate non-profit corporation which will run the day care program. This non-profit corporation could be registered as a charity which provides a community service. In order to provide a community service, the day care program would need to make its services available to any child in the community. It is expected that the centre would not give priority enrollment to the children of employees. Under this management option, the employer may deduct the payments to the charitable corporation as a charitable donation. The availability of this provision in the Income Tax Act may be a factor which employers should consider in determining the management structure through which the child care program is established.

In the interviews with provincial officials, eight out of twelve respondents suggested that, should the federal government wish to encourage work-related day care, the possibility of providing tax incentives to employers could be explored. None, however, suggested specific tax policies which would affect the development of work-related child care services.

In the United States, recent changes to the Income Tax Regulations have enabled employers to provide approved child care services to employees as a tax-free benefit.[14] Under the terms of the Dependent Care Assistance Plan that was enacted in 1981 as part of the Economic Recovery Act, employers can directly provide child care, can arrange for an existing program to provide care, or can give child care allowance directly to parents. As well, parents can choose to forego a portion of their gross salary through a Salary Reduction Plan. The employer directs the funds in the Salary Reduction Plan to a designated child care program. Employers are required to develop a plan for approval by the tax authorities.

Because the regulations governing the Dependent Care Assistance Plan were issued as recently as April, 1984, it is difficult to know how these tax provisions may affect the development of services. Some child care experts believe that the high increase in the number of new work-related programs is the direct result of these changes in the tax laws.

4.4.4 Grants and Other Incentives

There is a range of grants and non-tax incentives which have been generated in order to encourage the development of work-related day care. These include capital, start-up, and most particularly, operating grants, the absence of which has been decisive, in some cases, in the failure to carry through on major initiatives.

For example, the lack of provincial funding for on-going operating costs in Ontario has been cited as a factor which indirectly restricts the development of work-related day care. The experience of the City of Toronto Task Force on Work-Related Daycare indicates that some employers and developers were prepared to spend the capital costs to setup a day care centre; however, they were reluctant to create a service which many employees would not be able to use because of high user fees. In one instance, both union and management officials in the garment industry expressed serious interest in establishing a centre for a large female employee group in a growing Canadian manufacturer of designer clothes. They both candidly quipped, "My girls need day care but how can they afford it? Where are the grants?" Despite the considerable efforts that went into this initiative, it never got off the ground.

In Quebec, it appears that the provincial policy which encourages public sector employees to make space available for day care centres has been an important factor in the development of work-related day care. During the 1982 round of public sector negotiations covering government employees, hospitals, community colleges, community facilities (known as CLSCs), universities, and some Crown corporations, the province agreed to add 6000 new day care spaces in the following three years. Although these programs are to be located in these various facilities, enrollment will be open both to employees and community.

Recently officials have interpreted this policy to mean that any new government building, hospital or community health centre which is built must contain day care space. For projects approved by l'Office des services de garde à l'enfance, the government pays for capital construction or renovation costs which exceed those grants which are regularly made by l'Office.

4.4.5 Employer/Employee Attitudes

The views of the employer as expressed by management and those of the employees of the sponsoring organization, as expressed by the trade unions and staff associations to which many belong, are important factors in the development of work-related day care.

The attitudes of senior management in sponsoring organizations are key factors in the development of child care services. Management attitudes often shape the philosophy that underlies day-to-day practice.[15] The widely held belief that all benefits to employees should be universal is a barrier which can inhibit the development of child care services. Because only a selective group of employees may benefit from child care services, some employers are reluctant to support it. Day care supervisors identified this as an issue. Similarly, six out of ten provincial officials believed that an absence of personnel policies that support affirmative action is a key barrier to the establishment of work-related child care. Provincial officials also cited a lack of information about employer-sponsored child care and a lack of awareness of the need for child care as factors that may restrict the development of these services.

One respondent mentioned that the preponderance of small business in the province was a barrier because these small enterprises could not support a child care program.

It is important to note that the traditional management attitude that employees should assume responsibility for their own child care services or that government should provide child care for those who need it has been identified as an inhibitory factor. In light of recent government policies that encourage equal opportunity (affirmative action), managers may be reluctant to express traditional views explicitly. The experience of the Task Force on Workplace Daycare and other independent consultants confirms that traditional management attitudes can be an inhibiting factor.

Management attitude can also facilitate the development of programs. One private sector program was initiated by a company president, a father of six children, whose wife had always worked outside the home. Recently a large public utility in Ontario announced the approval of an employee-initiated centre that will complement its affirmative action plan.

Management attitudes toward the economic aspect of sponsoring a child care program can be a barrier. From the viewpoint of provincial officials, financial considerations were significant factors. Five out of the ten respondents cited the lack of financial assistance as a barrier. Eight out of ten thought that high on-going costs were a barrier to established programs. To date, limited data are available regarding the attitudes of senior managers in Canada.

It is important to emphasize that some trade unionists are circumspect about strongly supporting the development of workplace day care.[16] An overriding concern is that the emerging coalitions of unionists, day care workers, parent-consumers and women's rights advocates may concentrate considerable resources in pushing for workplace day care and that the thrust for a universally accessible, publicly funded system will decrease.

Other concerns include apprehension about the suitability of many work environments for quality day care, the possibility that workplace day care may tie workers, especially women, to low-paying, undesirable jobs, and the fear that management may attempt to control the day care program. Trade unionists are cautious about creating more day care programs in which underpaid day care workers support a child care system which even many trade

unionists cannot afford to use. As one advocate pointed out, "it is wrong to assume that persuading an employer to cover some of the costs of workplace day care is easier than persuading governments to increase their day care financing expenditures." Finally, trade unionists point out that if work place day care is to provide high quality programming, then the cost will be substantial. In essence, workplace day care is not a cheap solution to the need for a comprehensive system.

While some trade unionists raise these serious concerns about the potentially negative effects of advocating workplace day care, other leaders contend that when unions have assumed a leadership role in social issues, government has followed with supportive policies. Major accomplishments such as the universally-accessible health care system have benefited everyone. Some unionists contend that the jointly-sponsored private health insurance plans which were obtained through collective bargaining convinced employers that these benefits should be universal. Employers, in turn, influenced government. Some optimistic day care advocates believe that the cooperative involvement of labour and management in employer-supported day care will develop into an effective lobby which will press for a comprehensive child care system. Because the development of employer-sponsored child care is still relatively recent, it is difficult to predict whether a labour and management partnership will emerge as a force to influence public policy.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The central questions facing the Task Force on Child Care with respect to work-related day care are:

- Does work-related day care have a role to play in the provision of quality child care which is both affordable and readily accessible?

- If so, what role should it play and what policies and initiatives might be proposed to ensure the appropriate growth and development of work-related day care?

At the level of the development of a comprehensive, affordable and accessible child care system, continued efforts to intitiate day care centres at specific worksites primarily for employees seem tangential at best and misplaced at worst. Many have and will continue to argue that work-related day care has few, if any, characteristics which positively and significantly distinguish it from community-based day care. On the contrary, it might be argued that the balance sheet is negative: that work-related day care, by focusing on the employees of a given company, serves too narrow a population and thereby restricts its flexibility to provide comprehensive and cost-effective care, that it goes against the grain of predominant parental preference (which is for care in the neighbourhood) with care in expensive oftentimes inappropriate locations, and that incentives to work-related day care tend to warp the urban development process and weaken the tax base or support a select group of employees with tax dollars which might otherwise go to support a more broadly based community system.

While there is some truth to these characterizations, they are one-sided. A good deal of work-related day care serves the broader community as well as the employees of a given worksite, although this is more the result of specific government policies (viz Quebec) than any intent of employer sponsors. Similarly, there is a considerable number of parents for whom day care at or near the worksite is the preferred choice, one which they should be able to continue to exercise. Finally, sound urban planning principles can be maintained while continuing to encourage the development of day care in the urban core through the judicious use of appropriate incentives which, it might be said in passing, have supported and expanded the provision of care to a population which is broader than the employees of a specific work-site.

In the current context, where the continuing demand for quality care goes unmet, work-related day care, despite its limitations, can add badly-needed spaces to a community-based system. Such care should be viewed as part of the broader community system providing care to both employees and non-employees alike.

Specific initiatives in support of work-related day care might include:

- the development of alternative approaches to planning and implementing work-related day care in central urban environments, including the required planning stages and components and model agreements;

- the development of resource centres which would provide both technical information to assist in specific developments and broader educational materials to encouarge both employers and unions to support the development of work-related day care;

- the development of alternative approaches to zoning and day care licensing regulations which, while supportive of quality care, are also appropriate to central urban environments particularly with respect to height restrictions and traditional conceptions of play areas;

- exploring possible tax incentives for employers who support work-related day care. Such incentives could cover relief from property tax to special credits for capital and operating expenditures. These might apply whether the employer's support is directly to a company department or through the establishment of a non-profit entity which would permit greater involvement by parents;

- federal aid to provinces that provide operating grants on a non-selective basis to day care centres. This is clearly aimed at all day care centres and not just work-related programs. Nevertheless it would have a significant impact on their development as well.

These are but a few general initiatives aimed at enhancing the development of work-related day care in the current environment. They clearly require further elaboration, particularly with regard to defining work-related day care as part of a broader community-based system.

NOTES

1 White, Julie, Review of Federal Government Legislation on Day Care, Unpublished paper for Status of Women Canada, June, 1981, p. 3.

2 Grant, L. et al., Children at Work: An Inventory of Work-Related Day Care in Canada, Toronto: Social Planning Council, October, 1982.

3 Estimated by Health and Welfare Canada.

4 Estimated by the Ministry of State for Social Development.

5 When the Social Credit government came into power and put the delivery of employee benefits out to tender, it was agreed that the remaining funds would be used for a number of pilot projects, of which a day care was one.

6 The status of this centre in Victoria has since changed. It is no longer formally connected to the union although it still serves union employees as well as families in the community.

7 CUPE (Ontario Division). "On Resolving Ontario's Child Care Crisis." Brief sumbmitted to the Ontario Standing Committee on Social Development, September 13, 1984, p. 23.

8 A full discussion of details of paid parental leave and the implications thereof is beyond the scope of this study.

9 Milkovich, G. and L. Gomez, Day Care and Selected Employee Work Habits. Academy of Management Journal 19: 1976, pp. 111-115.

10 It should be noted, however, that waiting lists are not a very reliable measure of demand since some parents go on several waiting lists, while others may perceive the list as prohibitive and fail to register.

11 PMA Consulting Group Ltd. A Survey of Private-Home Day Care in Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto, 1983, pp. 94-116.

12 Ibid., p. 255.

13 Brooks, Neil, Tax Consequences of Work-Related Day Care Arrangements, Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1982, p. 5.

14 Burud, Aschbacher, and McCroskey, Employer-Supported Child Care: Investing in Human Resources, Dover, Massachusetts: Auburn House, 1984, p. 67.

15 Friedman, Dana E, Encouraging Employer Support to Working Parents, Carnegie Corporation: 1983, p. 25.

16 Workplace Day Care, One Option: paper presented by the Canadian Labour Congress at the Conference on Work-Related Day Care sponsored by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the University of Toronto, May 5, 1981.

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

	Centre	Location
1	BCGEU	Victoria, B.C.
2	7/11 Daycare Centre	Burnaby, B.C.
3	Valleyview Daycare	Port Coquitlam, B.C.
4	Bethany Care	Calgary, Alberta
5	Edmonton Hospital Workers Day Care	Edmonton, Alberta
6	University Hospital Daycare	Edmonton, Alberta
7	Regina General Hospital Daycare Co-op	Regina, Saskatchewan
8	Bambi's Centre	Shilo, Manitoba
9	Down's Child Centre	Winnipeg, Manitoba
10	Health Science Daycare Centre	Winnipeg, Manitoba
11	Lac du Bonnet Daycare	Lac du Bonnet, Manitoba
12	Children's Centre	Churchill, Manitoba
13	Growing Together Family Resources	Blenheim, Ontario
14	Mutual Life Daycare	Waterloo, Ontario
15	Chedoke McMaster Hospital Daycare	Hamilton, Ontario
16	Henderson Civic Hospital Daycare	Hamilton, Ontario
17	Base Borden Day Care	Angus, Ontario
18	A Child's World	Toronto, Ontario
19	Hester How	Toronto, Ontario
20	Kensington Infant Centre	Toronto, Ontario
21	Orde St. Daycare	Toronto, Ontario
22	Riverdale Hospital Day Nursery	Toronto, Ontario
23	Sunburst	Toronto, Ontario
24	Sunnybrook Centre	Toronto, Ontario
25	Treasure Island	Orillia, Ontario
26	Kingston Progressive Day Care	Kingston, Ontario
27	Pladec	Kingston, Ontario
28	Children on the Hill	Ottawa, Ontario
29	Jardin d'Enfants le C.E.P.	Noranda, Quebec
30	La Garderie la Gaminerie Inc.	Val d'Or, Quebec
31	La Garderie du Portage	Hull, Quebec
32	La Jeune Ronde Inc.	Hull, Quebec
33	Garderie la Jonglerie	Gatineau, Quebec
34	Garderie l'Oiseau Bleu	Buckingham, Quebec
35	Garderie Cadet Rouselle Valleyfield	Salaberry de Valleyfield
36	Garderie Claire Joie Inc.	Laval, Quebec
37	Garderie la Cachette	Laval, Quebec
38	La Garderie du Chul	Laval, Quebec
39	Garderie Communautaire Katerie	Ste. Catherine, Quebec
40	Garderie la Toupie	St. Louis de Terrebonne
41	Centre de Jour Pistache	Montreal, Quebec
42	Fleur de Papier	Montreal, Quebec
43	Garderie a la Claire Fontaine	Montreal, Quebec
44	Garderie au Pays des Schroumpfs	Montreal, Quebec
45	Garderie Bobino Bobinette	Montreal, Quebec
46	Garderie Carcajou	Montreal, Quebec

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

	Centre	Location
47	Garderie Chatouille	Montreal, Quebec
48	Garderie de l'Hôpital Royal Victoria	Montreal, Quebec
49	Garderie l'Enfanfreluche	Montreal, Quebec
50	Garderie Picasso	Montreal, Quebec
51	Garderie Pomme De Reinette	Montreal, Quebec
52	Garderie Ste. Justine	Montreal, Quebec
53	Garderie Tchou Tchou	Montreal, Quebec
54	Garderie Mademoiselle Pluche	Pt. Aux Trembles, Quebec
55	Garderie Palou la Coccinelle	Pt. Aux Trembles, Quebec
56	Garderie le Petite Pain d'Epice	Longueuil, Quebec
57	Garderie le Siffleux	St. Gabriel de Brandon
58	Garderie Sur Une Patte	Drummondville, Quebec
59	Garderie Sel et Poivre	Windsor, Quebec
60	Garderie les Pousinelles	Asbestos, Quebec
61	Garderie les Amis de la Maison Blanche	Sherbrooke, Quebec
62	Garderie les Petites Puces	Sherbrooke, Quebec
63	La Jardiniere du CHU Inc.	Fleurimont, Quebec
64	Garderie des Petits Mulots	Charlesbourg, Quebec
65	Le Petit Coeur	St. Foy, Quebec
66	Garderie Fan Fou	Quebec, Quebec
67	Garderie la Ribouldingue	Quebec, Quebec
68	Garderie le Pandore	Quebec, Quebec
69	La Garderie Clé de Sol	Quebec, Quebec
70	Garderie Feu Vert	Beauport, Quebec
71	Garderie la Marmaillerie	St. Ferdinand, Quebec
72	La Chiffonelle Garderie Co-opérative	Levis, Quebec
73	Garderie l'Aquarelle	St. Damien de Buckland, Quebec
74	Garderie la Cache-Cache	Chicoutimi, Quebec
75	La Garderie Trottineurs	Chicoutimi, Quebec
76	Garderie Mont Jolie	Mont Jolie, Quebec
77	La Garderie la Marmaille de Matane	Matane, Quebec
78	Northwood Childcare Centre	Halifax, Nova Scotia
79	Nanisivik Daycare Centre	Nanisivik, N.W.T.

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

Sponsor	Starting Date	Capacity	Enrollment (%)	Employee Users (%)
B.C. Gov't Employees' Union	1970	24	92	60
Southland Canada	1984	25	44	55
B.C. Gov't Employees Union	1983	37	100	60
Bethany Care Centre	1977	43	100	63
E.H. Childcare Society	1872	69	100	75
University Hospital	1967	41	100	100
Regina General Hospital	1982	40	63	63
Dept. National Defence	1974	30	100	90
Horsemen's Association	1981	26	54	100
Health Sciences Centre	1975	82	100	87
Lac du Bonnet Health Centre	1976	15	100	5
Churchill Health Centre	1974	40	68	19
Southwestern Regional Centre	1983	43	78	100
Mutual Life Assurance Co.	1982	40	95	100
Chedoke/McMaster Hospital	1984	57	86	100
Henderson Hospital	1983	42	100	97
Dept. National Defence	1980	41	95	97
York Board of Education	1981	20	100	90
City of Toronto	1980	50	88	59
Toronto Board of Education	1983	25	100	80
Toronto Board of Education	1979	62	88	24
Riverdale Hospital	1964	41	88	60
Fed. Atmospheric Service	1982	37	87	30
Sunnybrook Hospital	1983	48	94	60
Huronia Regional Centre	1982	34	88	90
Kingston General Hospital	1983	40	75	90
Kingston Psychiatric Hospital	1982	24	93	97
House of Commons	1982	40	98	66
C.H. Rouyn Noranda	1974	45	89	49
C.H. Val d'Or	1978	65	77	5
C.E.I.C.	1983	60	80	100
C.H. Hull	1983	57	86	100
C.H. Gatineau	1984	40	85	85
Hôpital Buckingham	1978	40	100	25
C.A. Val Séjour	1978	45	67	7
C.A. Maison Notre Dame	1978	30	100	100
Hôpital Cote de la Santé	1982	60	96	66
C.H. l'Université Laval	1979	61	100	50
CLSC Katerie	1977	60	97	0
CLSC La Mater	1979	30	100	10
C.H. Verdun	1983	30	100	57
Epiciers Unis Métro Richelieu	1983	42	71	20
CH Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine	1976	60	100	50

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

Sponsor	Starting Date	Capacity	Enrollment (%)	Employee Users (%)
CH Marie Enfant	1978	65	100	50
CLSC Rivières des Prairies	1978	35	100	12
Ecole Rosalie Jette	1979	40	100	5
CA Maison Lucie Bruneau	1981	60	83	20
CH Royal Victoria	1981	48	100	100
Lavalin	1981	60	92	100
CH Rivière des Prairies	1971	70	86	85
Banque Nationale du Canada	1980	40	100	100
Hôpital Ste. Justine	1977	62	81	94
National Film Board	1983	30	50	67
CA le Manbourg	1980	40	100	10
CLSC J. Octave Roussin	1978	30	100	20
Institut Louise Braille	1981	60	78	33
CLSC de Brandon	1979	37	97	11
Celanese Canada	1980	60	?	?
CLSC Windsor	1979	30	100	7
CLSC Asbestos	1980	33	91	7
Hôpital Hôtel de Dieu	1980	70	83	45
Centre St. Michel	1973	28	100	4
CH Sherbrooke	1975	50	84	100
CA le Foyer Mont St. Aubert	1980	45	100	5
Ministre de la Justice	1984	31	28	50
Hôpital St. Francois d'Assise	1980	45	100	75
CH Francois Charron	1980	47	100	50
Hôpital St. Sacrement	1979	50	90	75
CH Robert Gifford	1981	60	80	60
Ministère des Affairs Sociales	1979	30	87	50
Hôpital Ste. Julie	1981	30	83	70
Confédération des Caisses Populaires	1981	45	100	60
CA	1980	25	100	24
CLSC Saguenay-Nord	1981	45	96	2
Hôpital de Chicoutimi	1978	43	100	60
Hôpital de Mont Jolie	1978	60	73	25
CLSC Matane	1977	66	85	10
Northwood Inc.	1980	15	100	33
Strathcona Mineral Services	1976	60	100	90

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

	Infant Fees	Toddler Fees	Preschool Fees	On-going Support (Code at end)
1	N/A	N/A	$51	none
2	N/A	$46	$35	R/U/R&M/A/food
3	N/A	$90	$70	R/U/R&M
4	$68	$66	$61	pR/pU/pR&M
5	N/A	$69	$69	pA/ hospital does research for funding
6	N/A	N/A	$68	R/U/RM/bookeeping/A/staff benefits picks up reasonable deficits
7	N/A	$61	$61	R/U
8	N/A	$45	$45	R/U/R&M
9	$39	$39	$39	R/U/loans as needed
10	$108 *	$108 *	$108 *	pA/picks up deficit
11	N/A	N/A	$50	pA/use of kitchen
12	N/A	$60	$60	R/U/R&M/pA
13	$98	$80	$75	pR/pU/pR&M/pA
14	N/A	$65	$65	pA/picks up deficit
15	$110	$100	$85	R/U/pA/repayable loan
16	$100	$85	$75	Rent subsidy
17	$79	$62	$62	R/U/R&M/pA
18	N/A	N/A	$50	R/U/R&M
19	$90	$90	$83	R/U/pR&M/pA/operating grant
20	$100 *	$100 *	N/A	R/U/R&M/operating grant
21	N/A	N/A	$75	R/U/R&M/operating grant
22	$72	$72	$72	R/U/R&M/A/operating grant/pick up deficit
23	$11	$97	$85	R/U/R&M/food at cost
24	$120	$110	$80	R/R&M/food at cost/A/many services
25	N/A	$55	$55	U/pA
26	N/A	$90	$78	Reduced rent/pA
27	$100	$90	$85	R/U/R&M/pA/laundry
28	N/A	N/A	$84	R/U/R&M/food at cost
29	N/A	$60	$60	R/U
30	$60	$60	$60	no support
31	$86 **	$86 **	$72 **	R/U/pA
	$103 ***	$103 ***	$90 ***	
32	$78	$78	$78	R/pA reduced food costs
33	$70	$60	$50	no on-going support/all capital costs
34	$45	$45	$45	R/U
35	N/A	$78	$78	pR/pU/pR&M
36	$45	$45	$45	no support
37	$70	$70	$70	R/U
38	N/A	$70	$70	R/U/operating grant
39	$60	$60	$60	R/U/M
40	N/A	N/A	$67	don't know
41	N/A	$60	$60	R/U/R&M/pA
42	N/A	$63	$63	R/U/R&M/picked up deficit in 1984
43	$60	$60	$60	R/U/R&M/food at cost
44	$73	$63	$63	R/U/major maintenance
45	N/A	$65	$65	R/U
46	$60	$60	$60	pR/pU/pA/R&M
47	$73	$69	$69	R/U/pR&M

APPENDIX A

Work Related Day Care Inventory

	Infant	Toddler	Preschool	On-going Support (Code at end)
48	$69	$69	$69	R/U/pa/Food and maintenance at cost
49	$50	$50	$50	R/U/R&M/F/A/picks up deficit
50	$66 *	$66 *	$66 *	R/U/R&M/F/A
51	$65	$55	$55	R/U/R&M/pA/loans at reduced rates
52	$65	$65	$65	R/U/Food and laundry at cost
53	N/A	$59	$59	R/U/R&M
54	$69	$69	$69	pR/pU/pR&M/pF/pA
55	N/A	$60	$60	R/U/Food at cost
56	$62	$58	$58	R/U/R&M/pF/pA
57	$60	$60	$60	R
58	N/A	?	?	?
59	N/A	$55	$55	U
60	$55	$55	$55	R
61	$70	$70	$70	R/U
62	N/A	$70	$70	R
63	$60	$50	$50	R/U
64	N/A	N/A	$74	R/pU/pR&M
65	N/A	$65	$65	pR/pU
66	N/A	$70	$70	R
67	$73	$73	$73	R/U/R&M/pF
68	$70	$70	$70	R/U/food at cost
69	$70	$70	$70	R/U
70	N/A	$65	$65	pR
71	$55	$55	$55	pR/R&M/pF/pA
72	$65	$65	$65	pR
73	$55	$55	$55	pR/R&M/pF/pA
74	$55	$55	$55	pR/U/pR&M
75	N/A	$55	$55	R/U/interest-free loans if necessary
76	$58	$58	$58	R/pR&M
77	$55	$55	$55	pR
78	N/A	N/A	$60	R/U/R&M/A/operating grant/picks up deficit
79	$00	$00	$00	picks up complete costs

Notes:

Fees are listed at weekly rates.

* Centre has sliding fee scale; fee has been established at mid-point.
** Fee for Quebec residents.
*** Fee for Ontario residents.

CODE TO ON-GOING SUPPORT:

R - rent
U - utilities
R&M- repairs and maintenance
F - food
A - administrative support
p - partial

APPENDIX B

Provincial Funding Programs

		Regular Funding Programs	
Province	Total Spaces	Capital/Start-up	Maintenance
British Columbia	Group- 11 424 PHDC- 3 214	None	None
Alberta	Group- 26 442 PHDC- 3 084	None	0-18 mo.-$257/mo. 35-18 mo.-$131/mo. 3-4 yr.-$78/mo. 5 yrs.-$65/mo.
Saskatchewan	Group- 3 493 PHDC- 1 648	$600/licensed space for non-profit centres.	$100/yr./licensed space for equipment.
Manitoba	Group- 7 655 PHDC- 1 229	$286/licensed space	$992/yr/licensed space to non-profit centres $6.35/day/infant space.
Ontario	Group- 50 014 PHDC- 5 000	None	None
Quebec	Group- 26 393 PHDC- ?	$1000/licensed space to parent-controlled centres	$3.50/day/licensed space $1500/yr/infant space if in operation prior to 1983; 50% of occupancy costs up to $8000/yr/ centre.
Nova Scotia	Group- 7 873 PHDC- 65	$100/subsidized space for registered centres.	None
New Brunswick	Group- 2 885 PHDC- not yet registered	None	30 cents/day/child
Prince Edward Island	Group- 848 PHDC- 21	None	None
Newfoundland	Group- 769 PHDC- None	$500 to each new centre	None
Yukon	Group- 396 PHDC- 18	None	None
Northwest Territories	Group- 350 PHDC- 25 (approximate - as spaces are not licensed)	None	None

APPENDIX B

Province	Special Initiatives/Funding Programs
British Columbia	Emergency repair grant - up to $5 000 Relocation grant - up to $5 000
Alberta	Small centre grant for first centre in community with population of less than 3000 - given in decreasing amounts in the first year of operation while enrollment is between 11 and 15 children.
Saskatchewan	None
Manitoba	Audit grant - up to $980 for eligible centres. Fire safety upgrading and physical upgrading - up to $3 000
Ontario	Day Care Initiatives Program - may provide some capital or operational start-up funding to eligible organizations for informal care projects, private home day care, group centres and public education. Some capital funds specifically allocated for work-related day care.
Quebec	None
New Brunswick	Funding to New Brunswick Day Care Association.
Nova Scotia	None
Prince Edward Island	Annual grant to E.C.E. Development Equipment Library.
Newfoundland	None
Yukon	None
Northwest Territories	None

APPENDIX C

Day Care Centres in Post-Secondary Institutions

Province	Post-Secondary Institutions With Day Care Centres
British Columbia	Simor Fraser University
	University of British Columbia
	University of Victoria
	Comosun College
	Capilano College
	Cariboo College
	East Kootenay Community College
	Fraser Valley College
	Malaspina College
	Northwest Community College
	Selkirk College
	Vancouver Community College
Alberta	The University of Calgary
	The University of Lethbridge
	Grand Prairie Regional College
	Grant MacEwan Community College
	Kayano College
	Lakeland College
	Mount Royal College
	Red Deer College
Saskatchewan	University of Regina
	Kelsey Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences
	Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences
Manitoba	Brandon University
	The University of Manitoba
	The University of Winnipeg
	Assiniboine Community College
	Red River Community College
Ontario	Algonguin College of Applied Arts and Technology
	Brock University
	Cambrian College
	Carleton University
	Centennial College
	Confederation College
	Connestoga College
	Fanshawe College
	George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology
	Georgian College
	Humber College
	Lambton College
	Laurentian University of Sudbury
	McMaster University
	Mohawk College
	Niagara College
	Northern College
	Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

APPENDIX C

Day Care Centres in Post-Secondary Institutions

Province	Post-Secondary Institutions With Day Care Centres
Ontario (cont'd)	Queen's University at Kingston
	Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
	St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology
	Sault College
	Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology
	Sheridan College
	St. Lawrence College
	Trent University
	University of Toronto
	University of Waterloo
	University of Western Ontario
	University of Windsor
	York University
Quebec	CEGEP Ahuntsic
	CEGEP Andre Laurendeau
	GECEP de Granby
	CEGEP de Joliette
	CEGEP de Jonquiere
	CEGEP de Limoilou
	CEGEP de l'Outaouais
	CEGEP de Rosemonth
	CEGEP de Rimouski
	CEGEP de Saint-Jerome
	CEGEP de Sherbrooke
	CEGEP de Trois Rivières
	CEGEP Edouard Montpetit
	CEGEP Garneau
	CEGEP Levis Lauzon
	CEGEP Marie Victoria
	CEGEP Montmorency
	CEGEP Saint-Laurent
	CEGEP Vanier
	Université Concordia
	Collège McDonald
	Université de Montréal
	Université de Québec à Montréal
	Université de Sherbrooke
	Université Laval
	Université McGill
Nova Scotia	Mount St. Vincent University
New Brunswick	University of New Brunswick
Prince Edward Island	University of Prince Edward Island
	Holland College
Newfoundland	Memorial University of Newfoundland

APPENDIX D

Additional Resources

Association of Municipalities of Ontario -- Deirdre Gibson

Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto, Urban Affairs Department

Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association -- Jane Bertrand

Canadian Union of Public Employees -- Larry Katz

Centre for Public Advocacy Research -- Ronald Solway

City of Toronto, Task Force on Work-Related Daycare -- Martha Bobrovskis

City of Vancouver, Social Planning Department -- Ann Kloppenberg

Conference Board, Centre for Work and Family Life -- Dana E. Friedman

Family Day Care Services -- John Pepin

Government of Ontario

Gladys Ticktin, Day Care Counsellor
Dawna Burt, Ministry of Community and Social Services
Ellen Mills, Women's Directorate, Office of the Deputy Premier

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Community Services Department -- Maureen Edgar

Ontario Federation of Labour - Janis Serra

Ontario Hydro, Parents Steering Committee for Daycare -- Kim Taylor

Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto -- Laura Johnson

Task Force on Child Care -- Ruth Rose-Lizée

University of Toronto, Urban Centre -- Martha Friendly

United Auto Workers -- Wendy Cuthbertson

Victoria Day Care Services -- Renée Edwards

Young Women's Christian Association of Metropolitan Toronto -- Ellen Campbell

APPENDIX E

Interview Schedules

Survey of Provincial Officials

1. How many licensed group day care spaces were there as of June 1, 1984 in _____?

   Details:

2. Does _____ have any supervised private home day care?

   Yes: _____ If yes, how many? _____
   No: _____

3. How many subsidized spaces are there in _____ as of June 1, 1984? _____

4. What is the income ceiling for receiving subsidy?

   For a one parent, one child family: full subsidy _____
   partial subsidy _____
   For a two parent, two child family: full subsidy _____
   partial subsidy _____

   Comments:

5. Is there a limit on the subsidizable per diem rate?

   Yes: _____, Limit _____
   No: _____

6. In addition to funding for subsidized children, are there other regular provincial funding programs with legislative authority that are available for day care?

   No: _____
   Yes: _____, If yes (list amounts):

   start-up grants: _____
   capital: _____
   operational: _____
   direct/operating grant: _____
   other: _____

7. Are there any special provincial funding programs?

   Yes: _____
   No: _____

   Comments:

8. In _____, does a specific Ministry have the mandate to determine the overall need for day care services and how that need will be met?

   Yes: _____
   If yes, which Ministry?: _____
   How is that done?: _____

   No: _____
   If no, then what responsibility does the province have to plan for day care services? _____

9. Is the local municipality or region involved in direct day care services in any way?

   No: _____
   Yes: _____ If yes:
   Direct operation of day care programs: _____
   Purchase of day care services: _____
   Public health inspection: _____
   Fire inspection: _____
   Building inspection: _____
   Cost-sharing in subsidized day care: _____
   How much? _____
   Planning for day care services: _____
   Other: (specify) _____
   _____

10. What are the child-staff ratios in licensed group day care programs for (specify ages/age groupings):

    Infants: _____
    Toddlers: _____
    Preschoolers: _____

11. Now I would like to ask you some questions about employer-sponsored child care in _____. Employer-supported child care includes licensed day care programs and other support services to working families.

    * (If no programs have been identified:) I do not believe that there are any employer-supported day care centres in _____. Is this the case?

    Yes: _____
    No: _____ If no, explain: _____

* (If programs have been identified:) I would like to read you the list of employer-sponsored day cares that I am aware of in _____:

Licensed programs: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

(Use back of page for further listings)

Other programs: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Do you know of other licensed group of family day care programs that are employer-supported:

No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes, then list: _____
_____
_____

13. Are you aware of other employer-supported day care programs that are scheduled to open in the near future?

No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes, then list: _____
_____
_____

14. Are you aware of other employer-sponsored child care programs in the public, voluntary or private sector that support the needs of working parents, such as:

Information/referral services: _____
Parent education seminars in the workplace: _____
Short-term care for sick children: _____
Child care allowance/voucher: _____
Other (specify): _____

15. Has there been any discussion within the provincial government about employer-sponsored child care?

Yes: _____
If yes, can you tell me which ministries have been involved, and name any key individuals who may be able to provide further information:
_____
_____

No: _____
Don't Know: _____

16. Are there any key individuals at the municipal level who may be able to provide additional information:

    Yes: _____
    No: _____
    Don't know: _____
    Comments: _____
    _____

17. Have any studies been conducted or are any studies underway within the provincial government on employer-sponsored child care?

    Yes: _____ If yes, then list: _____
    _____

    No: _____

18. Are you aware of any other studies of employer-sponsored child care that have been conducted by other organizations in _____, such as:

    Unions: _____
    Human service organizations: _____
    Planning councils: _____
    Economic development agencies: _____
    Independent consultants: _____
    Other: _____

19. Are there currently any policy initiatives that the government of _____ has established to encourage employer-sponsored child care in the community?

    No: _____ If no, is the government of _____ planning any future initiatives to encourage employer-sponsored child care?

    Yes: _____
    No: _____ Explain: _____
    _____

    Yes: _____ If yes, what forms have these policy initiatives taken?
    Special funding for employer-sponsored day care programs:
    _____
    Staff consultation provided as public service to employers:
    _____
    Tax incentives to interested employers: _____
    _____
    General information as part of economic development promotion:
    _____
    Other: _____

20. Do you think that there are any barriers which may prevent or hinder an interested employer from developing a child care program?

    No/Not aware of barriers: _____
    Yes/Aware of barriers: _____
    If yes, are any of the following factors?

Strict licensing requirements for supervised day care: _____
Municipal zoning or building code restrictions: _____
Lack of financial assistance: _____
High on-going cost of operation: _____
Lack of personnel policies that promote equal opportunity/affirmative action: _____
Management reluctance to institute a selective benefit: _____

21. If an employer in _____ were interested in starting a day care program for employees, from which of these sources might she/he obtain assitance?

Independent consultants: _____
Social planning councils: _____
Day care programs which are marketing their services: _____
Provincial government offices: _____
Which ones?: _____
Local government offices: _____
Which ones?: _____
Other employers who have established programs: _____
Other (specify): _____

22. In its role as employer, has the government of _____ taken any steps toward the development of child care programs for its own employees?

Yes: _____ If yes: Needs survey: _____
Feasibility study: _____
Assisted in the establishment of programs(s): _____
Plans to increase involvement in near future (specify): _____

No: _____ If no: Issue has not been raised: _____
Issue was raised, but no action taken (specify reasons why): _____
_____
Issues currently under discussion: _____

23. Does _____ make available any of the following child care-related benefits to its employees?

Maternity leave: for 17 weeks: UIC only: _____
UIC supplmented: _____
beyond 17 weeks: Paid: _____
Unpaid: _____

Paternity leave: (specify amount) _____
Paid: _____
Unpaid: _____
Parental leave for adoptive parents: _____
Paid leave for sick children: _____
Information and referral to other child care services: _____
Child care allowance/voucher: _____
Other: _____

24. What steps do you think the federal government could take to encourage the development of employer-sponsored child care?

    Comments:

25. Does the government of _____ have any specific plans to initiate discussion with the federal government on issues related to employer-sponsored child care?

    Comments:

26. Finally, what role do you think that employer-sponsored day care can/could plan in a range of child care services?

    Comments:

27. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Work-related Day Care Survey

Preliminary Centre Interview

Name: _____
Date: _____

1. Name of centre: _____
   Phone number: _____
2. Location: _____
3. Name of supervisor: _____
4. Workplace: _____
5. Year centre opened: _____
6. Capacity:

   Age range: _____
   Infants: _____
   Toddlers: _____
   Preschoolers: _____
   TOTAL: _____

7. Current enrollment:

   Infants: _____
   Toddlers: _____
   Preschoolers: _____
   TOTAL: _____

8. Approximate number of employees enrolled: _____
   Percentage of employees: _____

9. Fees:

	Employees	Community
Infants:	_____	_____
Toddlers:	_____	_____
Preschoolers:	_____	_____

10. Management:

    Proprietary: _____
    Non-profit: _____
    Department of the organization: _____
    Other (specify): _____

11. Levels of support from employer:

    A. Start-up phase: Space: _____
    Renovations: _____
    New construction: _____
    Equipment: _____
    Administration: _____
    Staff time: _____
    Start-up grant: _____
    Amount: _____
    Day care salaries: _____
    Promotion/advertising: _____

B. Current:

	Full	Partial	None
Rent:	_____	_____	_____
Utilities:	_____	_____	_____
Repair/maintenance:	_____	_____	_____
Food:	_____	_____	_____
Administration:	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO
Operating grant:	_____	_____
If yes, amount:	_____	
Pick up deficit:	_____	_____
If yes, amount last year:	_____	

12. Comments:

Day Care Centre Survey

1. The name of your centre is: _____

2. Name of the supervisor: _____

3. What is the name of the organization/employer who sponsored the day care program? _____

4. What type of organization is this:

   Government: _____
   Union: _____
   Health care facility: _____
   Other public sector: _____
   Private sector: _____

5. How many hours per day is the company/employer in operation?

   24 hrs/day: _____
   7am - 6pm: _____
   other: _____

6. Do you know the approximate percentage of female employees in the company/ organization? _____

7. Where is your centre located: _____

   City: _____
   Town: _____
   Urban: _____
   Suburban: _____
   Rural: _____

8. Is your day care centre:

   On-site: _____
   Off-site: _____ How far? _____
   Other: _____

9. What year did the day care centre open:

   Year: _____
   Don't know: _____

10. What was the most important objective that the employer/company was trying to meet by establishing a day care centre?

    List reasons: _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

11. a) What did the employer provide in the start-up phase:

Donation of space: _____
Renovations to exising space:
Major: _____
Minor: _____
New construction: _____
Equipment:
Fully equipped: _____
Partialley equipped: _____

b) Did it help out with:

Administration: _____
Staff time: _____
Start-up grant:
Amount: _____
Day care salaries prior to opening: _____
Promotion/adversiting: _____
Other: _____
Don't know: _____

12. a) Did you receive any other sources of funding in the initial phase?

No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes (specify amounts): _____
Government grant: _____
Funding from union/employee group: _____
Funding from a foundation: _____
Other: _____

b) Did you fundraise?

Yes: _____
No: _____

Did you receive any other start-up money?

Yes: _____ specify: _____
No: _____

13. I am interested in knowing about other child-related benefits presently provided by the company/employer:

Maternity leave: For 17 weeks: UIC only: _____
UIC supplemented: _____

For more than 17 weeks: Paid: _____
Unpaid: _____

Paternity leave (specify amount):

Paid: _____
Unpaid: _____
Paid time off for sick children: _____
Information/referral service: _____

Supervised private home day care: _____
Payment/vouchers: _____
Other: _____
Don't know: _____

14. How is the centre managed? Is it:

separate non-profit organization: _____
a department of the organization: _____
run by an independant owner/operator: _____
other: _____

15. What hours is the day care centre open?

Regular day time: _____
Has there been a demand for extended hours?
No: _____
Yes: _____ Has this been considered?
Yes: _____
No: _____

Extended evening: _____
24 Hour: _____

16. Are you open on weekends?

Yes: _____
No: _____

17. a) How many children is the centre licensed for? _____
What is the age breakdown: Infants: _____
Toddlers: _____
Preschoolers: _____

b) For centres who have no infants:
Has there been a demand for infant care?

No: _____ Has the employer made any provisions to assist parents in finding care for infants?
Yes: _____
No: _____

Yes: _____ If yes, why does your centre not have it?
Expense: _____
Licensing does not permit: _____
No space to expand: _____
Other: _____
Don't know: _____

18. What has been the average enrollment over the last 16 months:

i) Infants: _____
Toddlers: _____
Preschoolers: _____
ii) TOTAL: _____

Are any of these children part-time?
Yes: _____
No: _____

Do you have any subsidized children?
Yes: _____ If yes, what has been the average enrollment over the last 6 months: _____
No: _____

19. On average, what percentage of mothers, as opposed to fathers, regularly bring children to day care:

Mothers: _____
Fathers: _____

What is the approximate percentage of:

Single-parent families: _____
Two-parent families: _____

20. Who uses the program?

Employees only: _____
Employees, plus community: _____

Do employees have priority over the community?
Yes: _____
No: _____

Do some employees have priority over others? (describe)
Yes: _____
No: _____

21. Do you maintain a waiting list?

No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes, is there a separate list for community?
Yes: _____
No: _____

Approximate total of names on waiting list: _____

22. What are the fees (as of September 1, 1984) for:

	Employees	Community
Infants:	_____	_____
Toddlers:	_____	_____
Preschoolers:	_____	_____

23. How does this fee compare with other day care programs in your area?

	Employees	Community
Higher:	_____	_____
Same:	_____	_____
Lower:	_____	_____

24. Would you say that, relative to staff salaries in your area, salaries at your centre are on average:

    Higher: _____
    Same: _____
    Lower: _____

25. Is your staff unionized?
    Yes: _____
    No: _____

    Is there a collective agreement?
    Yes: _____
    No: _____

26. What is the current level of support from the employer:

	None	Partial	Full
rent:			
utilities:			
maintenance:			
repairs:			
administrative support:			
operating grant:			
picks up deficit:			
other:			

27. Has this level of support changed since the centre opened?

    Yes: _____ If yes, describe: _____
    _____

    No: _____

28. Do you foresee any changes to the employer involvement in the future?

    Yes: _____ If yes, specify: _____
    _____

    No: _____

29. Do you receive:

    Provincial govrenment grants: operating: _____
    one-time (specify): _____
    Federal grants: _____
    Money from a social service agency: _____
    Money from an employee group/union: _____
    Other: _____

30. Could you briefly describe the level of parental involvement:

    Serving on Board of Directors: _____
    Serving on Committees: _____
    Participating directly in the classroom: _____
    Serving on Advisory Board: _____
    Other: _____

How useful do you find parental involvement?

Very useful: _____
Somewhat useful: _____
Not very useful: _____

31. Could you describe the involvement of the employer. Does someone from Management:

Serve on a Board of Directors: _____
Serve on Committees: _____
Do public relations on behalf of the centre: _____
Other: _____

How useful do you find Management participation?

Very useful: _____
Somewhat useful: _____
Not very useful: _____

32. Does your centre meet provincial staffing requirements?

Yes: _____
No: _____

Does it exceed them?

No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes, how? Additional teaching staff: _____
Resource teacher: _____
Specialist: _____
Other (describe): _____

33. Has an evaluation of the centre been conducted by the employer to determine if any of the original goals has been met?

Yes: _____ If yes, was it: Formal: _____
Informal: _____

No: _____ If no, has any other kind of evaluation been produced?
No: _____
Yes: _____ If yes, please summarize key points: _____
_____

34. I'd like to ask you about the benefits and disadvantages of work-related day care. In order of importance, could you list up to 3 main advantages, from the parent's perspective:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

And up to 3 disadvantages from a parent's perspective:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

35. And advantages from the employer's perspective:

    1. _____
    2. _____
    3. _____

    And now disadvantages from the employer's perspective:

    1. _____
    2. _____
    3. _____

36. Has your day care centre ever experienced any of the following difficulties:

    Financial: _____
    Low enrollment: _____
    High staff turnover: _____
    Other: _____

37. Do you see any changes to your program in the near future, such as:

    Size: Expand: _____
    Decrease: _____

    Change in age group mix: _____

    Change in user group mix: Open to community: _____
    Increase community spaces: _____
    Decrease community spaces: _____
    Other: _____

38. In an average week, do you receive any calls for information or assistance on workplace day care?

    Yes: _____ If yes, how many? _____
    No: _____

39. What kind of reporting mechanism do you have to your sponsoring organization?
    Describe: _____
    _____

40. Do you have any regular contact with other workplace day care programs?

    Yes: _____ If yes, which ones: _____
    _____
    _____

    No: _____

41. Are there any organizations you know of in your community that provide assistance in starting a workplace day care program?

    Yes: _____ If yes: Government body: _____
    Community information centre: _____
    Private consultants: _____

Advocacy groups: _____
Other: _____

No: _____

42. Are you aware of any new workplace day care programs in your area, or any that are in the planning stage? _____
_____

APPENDIX F

Bibliography on Work-related Day Care

Acheson, S. and C. Macleod. Parental Rights and Day Care: A Bargaining Guide for Unions. Don Mills, Ontario: Ontario Federation of Labour, 1982.

Attenborough, S. Bargaining for Equality. Ottawa: National Union of Provincial Government Employees, 1982.

Beach, J. and L. Rothman. Initial Comments on the Establishment of Non-Profit Day Care Programs. Toronto: Task Force on Work-Related Daycare Programs, Department of Planning and Development, City of Toronto, November, 1982.

Brenner, A.J. and D.S. Iskowe. "Taxpayers with Dependents and their Employers Both Have Tax Opportunities," Taxation for Accountants, March 1983.

Brooks, N. Tax Consequences of Work-Related Daycare Arrangements, Background Paper. Toronto: Workplace Daycare Resource Group and Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, February 1983.

Brouillet, C., C. Mercie et R. Tessier. Des garderies malgré tout, situation des garderies au Québec en 1981. Offices des services de garde à l'enfance, 1981.

Bouchard, L. et R. Spain. Les services de garde au Québec: une vue d'ensemble. Québec: Offices des services de garde à l'enfance, 1982.

Brudney, J.F. "This Firm's Day Care Service A Hit with Everyone," Boston Globe, November 13, 1983.

Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. Employers and Child Care: Development of a New Employee Benefit. Washington: Bureau of National Affairs, 1984.

Burud, S.L., P.R. Aschbacher and J. McCroskey. Employer-Supported Child-care: Investing in Human Resources. Dover, Mass.: Auburn Publishing Company, 1984.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, National Day Care Information Centre, Provincial Funding of Daycare Services. Ottawa Department of National Health and Welfare, National Daycare Information Centre, 1982.

Canada. Treasury Board. "Government Approves Program for Day Care Centres," Press Release. Ottawa: Treasury Board, June 26, 1981.

"Canadian Fab Workers Win Childcare," in UAW Newsletter, Vol. 13, No. 48, December 16, 1983.

Canadian Labour Congress. Workplace Daycare: One Option. Toronto, SDC and University of Toronto, n.d.

Carey, E. "Boardroom Baby Talk Can Pay Dividends," Toronto Star, September 11, 1983.

Catin, S., J. Boucher et D. Tessier. Situation actuelle et perspectives de développement des services de garde à l'enfance à Québec 1983-1988. Québec: Offices des services de garde à l'enfance, n.d.

Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec/Confédération des syndicats nationaux. Dossier garderie: pour un réseau universel et gratuit. Comités de la condition feminine, CEQ-CSN, September 1979.

"Child Care Help by Employers Takes on New Twist in Some Locales," Wall Street Journal, December 20, 1982.

City of Toronto, Department of Planning and Development. Child Care Survey, Yonge-Eglinton Area (unpublished survey), 1983.

Clifford, H. Status of Day Care in Canada. Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare, 1983.

Collins, M.A., ed. Business and Child Handbook, Business and Childcare Project. Minneapolis, Indiana: Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, 1982.

Comité Laure-Gaudreault. Condition féminine, Analyse de la problématique des garderies au Québec. Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec, May 1975.

Contenta, S. "Union Wins Day Care Plan at Auto Firm," Toronto Star, December 12, 1983.

Copps, M.J. "Day Care Alternatives: Investing in Tomorrow," Real Estate News, March 9, 1984.

Corning Glass Works. The Corning Story: Solving the Puzzle of Industry-Sponsored Daycare. New York: Corning Glass Works, n.d.

"Corporate Kids," New York Times, March 13, 1983.

Council on Labour and Industry. Children's Village. Philadelphia: Council on Labour and Industry, n.d.

CUPE. Facts and Figures on Caring for Kids. CUPE for the Ontario Federation of Labour Women's Committee, November 1979.

CUPE (Ontario Division). On Resolving Ontario's Child Care Crisis: Brief to the Ontario Standing Committee on Social Development. CUPE, September 13, 1984.

CUPE. Report of the CUPE National Day Care Committee. CUPE, October 1983.

Cuthbertson, W. "Demanding Day Care: Autoworkers Win Historic Agreement on Child Care," Our Times, February 1984.

"Daycare Deduction Hike Urged," The Gazette (Montreal), May 5, 1982.

"Daycare Helps People Work," Toronto Star, June 2, 1984.

"Daycare Plans to Be Included in Expansion," The Globe and Mail, March 3, 1984.

"Daycare Success at Sunnybrook," Toronto Star, February 28, 1984.

DeHann, E. "Babies and the Boardroom," Focus, April 27, 1983.

Dennis, W. "A Delicate Balance: Solving the Kids/Career Conundrum," City Woman, Winter 1983.

Dineen, J. "City May Come Up with $1 Million to Raise Scandalous Day Care Wages," Toronto Star, December 11, 1983.

Emlen, A. and P. Koren. Hard to Find and Difficult to Manage: The Effects of Childcare on the Workplace. Portland: Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University, 1984.

Evans, F.L. "Small Ends Up Big in Magna Empire," Financial Post, October 19, 1983.

Family Daycare Services. "Companies Meet to Design Daycare Program," Family Day Care Service News, No. 2, December 1982.

Family Daycare Services. The Working Parents Daycare Assurance Plan. Toronto: Family Daycare Services, n.d.

"Feminists, MPs Slam Proposal to Cut Spouses," The Citizen (Ottawa), January 1, 1983.

Fitterer, A. "Toronto's Daycare Crisis," Real Estate News (Toronto Real Estate Board), Vol. 4, No. 2, January 8 1982.

Friedman, D.E. Encouraging Employer Support to Working Parents: Community Strategies for Change. New York: Centre for Public Advocacy Research, March 1983.

Friendly, M. and L. Johnson. "Perspectives on Work-Related Daycare," Child in the City Report. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1981.

Gentleman, G. Work-Related Child Care Support for Families: A Background Paper. Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services, April, 1983.

Gouvernement du Québec, Offices des services de garde à l'enfance. Où faire garder nos enfants? Guide répertoire des services de garde en garderie et en milieu familial. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, n.d.

Gouvernement du Québec, Offices des services de garde à l'enfance. Situation actuelle et perspectives de développement des services de garde à l'enfance au Québec 1938-1988. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 1983.

Government of Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services. Daycare Bibliography. Toronto: Government of Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, February 1979.

Government of Ontario, Ministry of Labour. Workplace Childcare: A Background Paper. Toronto: Ministry of Labour, Women's Bureau, January 1981.

Grant, L. et al. Children at Work: An Inventory of Work-Related Daycare in Canada. Toronto: Social Planning Council, October 1982.

Grant, L. et al. Work-Related Day Care: An Annotated Bibliography. Toronto: Social Planning Council, No. 49, October, 1982.

Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association and Resources of Child Caring, Inc. Parents in the Workplace: A Management Resource for Employers. Minneapolis: Greater Minneapolis Daycare Association and Resources of Child Caring, Inc., n.d.

Hepburn, B. "Wives Work for Cash - Not 'Fulfillment,' Study Shows," Toronto Star, June 21, 1984.

Herzog, C. "Day Care Issues Fast Become Management's," in The Financial Post, January 31, 1984.

Hewlett, S.A. "Quandries: Child Carelessness," in Harper's, Vol. 257, No. 1602, November, 1983.

Huck, J.B. "Erola Favours Bigger Tax Break for Day Care," Winnipeg Free Press, September 24, 1982.

Human Services of Scarborough, Day Care Subcommittee, Women's Committee. Scarborough Workplace Daycare Project, Draft Report. Scarborough, Human Services of Scarborough, 1984.

Hurst, L. "Companies Start Moving on Day Care," Toronto Star, June 5, 1984.

Hurst, L. "Like it or Not, Day Care is an Economic Necessity," in Toronto Star, December 16, 1983.

Johnson, L.C. "Measuring Day Care Need: The Numbers Game," in Social Infopack (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto), Vol. 3, No. 2, June 1984.

Johnson, L. Who Cares?: A Report of the Project Child Care Survey of Parents and Their Childcare Arrangements. Toronto: Community Daycare Coalition and Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, November 1977.

Kirzner, E. "Working Day Care into the Workplace," NOW Magazine (Toronto), April 26-May 2, 1984.

Labour Canada. Maternity and Child Care Leaves in Canada. Ottawa, Labour Canada, 1983.

Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto. Day Care Policy. Toronto: Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto, n.d.

Lavalin in Public: "Lavalin Day Care Centre Officially Inaugurated," Lavalin, November-December, 1981.

Lavoie, G. "Et si le fisc abolissait l'exemption de mari(e)s," La Presse, 5 janvier 1983.

"Les garderies, un service essentiel," La Presse, September 24, 1982.

List, W. "Strikers at GM Back on the Job Starting Tonight," The Globe and Mail, October 29, 1984.

List, W. "Work-Site Child Care Helps Kids, Bosses," NASW News, January 1984.

Lynch, M., ed. Civic Affairs: Work-Related Day Care - Helping to Close the Gap. Toronto: Bureau of Municipal Research, September 1981.

Martin, J. "Day Care: A National Concern," Perception, Vol. 8, No. 1, September/October, 1984.

Milkovitch, G. and L. Gomez. "Day Care and Selected Employee Work Behaviors," Academy of Management Journal 19, 1976.

"Mme Erola veut faire payer plus d'impôt aux maris," Le Devoir, January 6, 1983.

Mayfield, M.I. Employer-Supported Childcare: A Descriptive Analysis. Victoria B.C.: Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, July 1984.

Mayfield, M.I. Employer-Supported Childcare: Bibliography. Victoria, B.C.: Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, July 1984.

McCorskey, J. "Work and Families: What is the Employer's Responsibility?" in Personnel Journal, January 1982.

McLaughlin, S. Physical Barriers to Daycare in Downtown Office Complexes. Toronto: Task Force on Work-Related Daycare, Department of Planning and Development, City of Toronto, December 1983.

Oloman, M. Support for Child Care at Canadian Universities and Colleges. Vancouver: Childcare Services, University of British Columbia, 1983.

Organized Working Women. Day Care and the Union Movement: Backgroun Paper. Toronto: Organized Working Women, March 1980.

Roberts, D. "Workplace Day Care Becomes More Popular, City Conference Told," The Whig-Standard (Kingston), March 17 1984.

Rodriguez, N. "Bringing the Kids to Work," Business Report, February-March, 1983.

Senn-Perry, K. Employers and Child Care: Establishing Services Through the Workplace. Washington: U.S. Department of Labour, Office of the Secretary, Women's Bureau, pamphlet 23, n.d.

Sewell, J. " A Towering Concept," The Globe and Mail, March 11 1974.

Silversides, A. " Daycare 'Critical' Issue for Farm Wives," The Globe and Mail, May 4 1984.

Smith, J. " Daycare a Major Issue for Business Welch Maintains," Toronto Star, May 30 1984.

Snow, W. " Home Away From Home: Employees get Huronia Day Care Centre Working," Topical (Toronto), June 24 1983.

Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. A Trade Union Perspective on Work-Related Daycare, Conference on Work-Related Daycare. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and Child in the City Program, University of Toronto, May 5 1981.

Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. Report of the Task Force on Work-Related Daycare. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, November 1982.

Speirs, R. "Davis Day Care Policy is Pitifully Inadequate," Toronto Star, April 1984.

Spiering, B. "Babysitting Employers," The Financial Post, February 1984.

Sweet, L. "Day Care Services Are Child's Right," Toronto Star, February 11 1984.

Sweet, L. "Day Care Stats Ignore Part-Timers," Toronto Star, January 10 1984.

Sweet, L. "Voices of Rural Women Heard at Last," Toronto Star, July 7 1984.

Taylor, L. "Employer Benefits: What About the Kids?" Benefits Canada, Fall 1983.

Verzaro, Lawrence, et al. "Industry-Related Daycare: Trends and Options," Young Children, Vol. 37, No. 32, January 1982.

Wells, J. "Companies are Toddling, If Not Working, Into Day Care," in Canadian Business, Vol. 56, No. 1, January 1983.

"What's Happening... in Manitoba," Canadian Nurse, Vol. 77, No. 8, September 1981.

White, Julie. Review of Federal Government Legislation Daycare (unpublished paper). Ottawa: Status of Women Canada, June 1981.

Workplace Daycare Resource Group and the Task Force on Work-Related Daycare. Children at Daycare/Parents at Work. Toronto: City of Toronto, 1983.

PUBLICATIONS IN SERIES

SERIES 1: **FINANCING CHILD CARE: CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS**

Financing Child Care Through the Canada Assistance Plan
Monica Townson

Child Care and Taxation in Canada: Who Pays?
Mona G. Brown and Delia J. Power

The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market
Patti Schom Moffatt

Municipal Initiatives in Child Care
Tamra L. Thomson

Government Spending on Child Care in Canada
Christine Blain

SERIES 2: **FINANCING CHILD CARE: FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS**

Toward Universality: An Historical Overview of the Evolution of Education, Health Care, Day Care and Maternity Leave
Nancy Miller Chenier and Dorothy LaBarge

National Day Care Costing Model
DPA Group Inc.

An Overview of Some Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Proposed Options for Financing a System of Child Care in Canada
Karen Stotsky

Job Creation in the Child Care Industry
Nancy Tienhaara

A Proposal to Cost-share Operating and Start-up Grants to Day-Care Centres: Ten Year Estimate of the Impact on Day-Care Spaces, Percentage of Need Met, Salaries, User Fees, Employment and Federal Expenditures
Ruth Rose-Lizée

SERIES 3: **CHILD CARE: STANDARDS AND QUALITY**

Day Care Standards in Canada
Hélène Blais Bates

Enforcement of Provincial Day Care Standards
Tamra L. Thomson

Day Care Quality: Its Definition and Implementation
Donna S. Lero and Irene Kyle

The Informal Child Care Market: Public Policy for Private Homes
Nancy Miller Chenier based on research by Hélène Blais Bates

The Effects of Day Care on Children, Families and Communities:
A Review of the Research Findings
Steen B. Esbensen

SERIES 4: **CHILD CARE: THE EMPLOYER'S ROLE**

Paid Parental Leave Policies: An International Comparison,
with Options for Canada
Monica Townson

A Study of Work-Related Day Care in Canada
Rothman Beach Associates

SERIES 5: **CHILD CARE NEEDS OF PARENTS AND FAMILIES**

Child Care Needs of Immigrants
Pearl Downie

Parents' Needs, Preferences, and Concerns About Child Care:
Case Studies of 336 Canadian Families
Donna S. Lero, et al.

SERIES 6: **A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CANADIAN DAY CARE RESEARCH**

A Bibliography of Canadian Day Care Research
Alan Pence